

Also, a bill (H. R. 10922) granting a pension to Phoebe Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 10923) granting an increase of pension to James Hamilton Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of Manhattan Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of New York City, asking that nurses be given military rank; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Evidence to accompany House bill 10855, granting a pension to Noah Stump; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of Federation for the support of Jewish Philanthropic Societies, favoring House bill 9223 and Senate bill 3730, exempting incomes from religious, educational, and philanthropic legacies from the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of United Garment Workers of America, favoring bill to amend the naturalization laws of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of First Congregational Church of Waseca, Minn., and Amboy (Ill.) Woman's Club, against increase in postage on second-class matters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of H. C. Cooley and 35 other citizens of Hillsboro, Wis., asking for war prohibition as a food-conservation measure; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of 2,200 men and women of Ohio, on war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Granville Thurston Post, Grand Army of the Republic, in behalf of relief of Union soldiers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petitions of Association of National Advertisers (Inc.); Woman's Council, of Akron, Ohio; Springfield (Mass.) Chamber of Commerce; First Congregational Church, of Waseca, Minn.; Woman's Civic Betterment Club, of Roanoke, Va.; De Laval Separator Co., of New York; General Federation Magazine (Inc.), of Washington, D. C.; Tuesday Club, of River Falls, Wis.; Lake View Woman's Club, of Chicago, Ill.; Peripatetic Club, of Brookhaven, Miss., and Minot Art Club, of Minot, N. Dak., all asking the repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the R. A. Pierce Post, No. 190, Grand Army of the Republic, New Bedford, Mass., protesting against the reduction of salaries to six letter carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Memorial of Seventh Day Adventist Church, Battle Creek, Mich., against passage of Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of Presbyterian Church, of Santa Maria, and Memorial Baptist Church, of Mountain View, Cal., favoring immediate prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KINKAID: Resolutions by citizens of Garfield County, Nebr., in favor of standing by the President in war and against the manufacture of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLINTIC: Petition of Mrs. E. V. Stalnoker and 36 other residents of Carpenter, Okla., protesting against the zone system for periodical postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Camargo, Okla., asking for the repeal of the second-class postage provision of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Ogdensburg, N. Y., for the immediate passage of the national war-prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petitions of Reformed Presbyterian Church, Third United Presbyterian Church, Mahoning Presbyterian Church, Epworth Methodist Episcopal Church, and First Methodist Episcopal Church, all of New Castle, Pa., favoring prohibition as a war measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of New Haven (Conn.) Branch of National Metal Trades' Association, on behalf of amendment providing for quarterly payments of income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, March 21, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thy gracious favor for the duties of this day. Impress us more and more with our dependence upon Thee, that in places of leadership and power we dare not face the responsibilities of life or of this office, representing the interests of millions of Thy children, except as we are impressed and guided by the spirit of truth and justice and love. O God, take us by the hand and lead us this day. For Christ's sake, Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by G. F. Turner, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 154) authorizing the erection of a memorial in Washington to the memory and in honor of the members of the various orders of sisters who gave their services as nurses on battle fields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals during the Civil War, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I have petitions from the American Defense Society, signed by thousands of people in the State of Michigan, protesting against disloyal utterances or conduct unbecoming an American citizen in the present crisis. I ask that they be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. RANSDELL. I present a large number of petitions asking Congress to enact forthwith a law imposing punishment upon all persons or organizations responsible for pro-German activities, or for the publication or public utterance of statements tending to impede or interfere with the operations or success of the United States in war, or in recruiting or enlistment, or to hold the Government of the United States or any of our allies up to ridicule or obloquy, or to cause disloyalty or refusal of duty on the part of any person in connection with the war.

The petitions are signed by 60,000 citizens of Louisiana. I ask that they be given the proper reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. To what committee does the Senator think the petitions should go?

Mr. RANSDELL. The Judiciary Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well.

Mr. MCCUMBER. I present a number of petitions and ask to have them referred to the proper committee, saying in explanation that they are petitions from the American Defense Society of the State of North Dakota and contain many thousands of names. I will ask that the Secretary may simply read the heading of one of the petitions, which is very short, and then have them referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been read once this morning.

Mr. MCCUMBER. Then I ask that it may be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the heading of one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[American Defense Society, State of North Dakota.]

Petition of the people of the United States of America to the Congress at Washington.

Whereas the security of the United States and the success of our arms are endangered by the activities of disloyal persons and organizations within the borders of our country, we, the citizens of the United States whose names are hereto subscribed, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States to enact forthwith a law imposing punishment upon all persons or organizations responsible for pro-German activities or for the publication or public utterance of statements tending—

To impede or interfere with the operations or success of the United States in war or in recruiting or enlistment; or

To hold the Government of the United States or any of our allies up to ridicule or obloquy; or

To cause disloyalty or refusal of duty on the part of any person in connection with the war.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of Local Branch, National Woman's Party, of Portland, Me., praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented resolutions adopted by the Associated Chambers of Commerce of the Pacific Coast, relative to the sites for naval bases on the Pacific coast, and indorsing the findings and recommendations of the Naval Commission, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

NATION-WIDE PROHIBITION.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, at the election in 1916 the State of South Dakota adopted a constitutional amendment providing for State-wide prohibition. The legislature then enacted a law, which went into effect on the 1st of July, 1917, providing for State-wide prohibition in pursuance of the constitutional amendment. I am just now in receipt of the following telegram:

South Dakota ratifies unanimously; house 87, senate 43. First State to make a unanimous record.

Thus ratifying, of course, the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I simply want to express my satisfaction and pride, Mr. President, in this record made by my State.

REPORTS FROM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 3571) granting lands for school purposes in lots No. 111 in each of the town sites of Fort Shaw and Simms, Sun River reclamation project, Mont., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report (No. 322) thereon.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 390) to establish the Grand Canyon National Park, in the State of Arizona, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 321) thereon.

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

Mr. OVERMAN. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 3771) authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government.

I give notice that I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill after the disposition of the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to present a substitute for the report of the committee, or for the bill. I wish to have the substitute bill that I present printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia means an amendment in the nature of a substitute?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I know it is usually called an amendment. It is really a substitute, and I like that language better.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If the substitute is to be printed in the RECORD, I suggest that the original bill be printed also in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should like very much to have both printed together.

Mr. OVERMAN. I was just going to ask that the original bill be printed, and as the Senator from Georgia offers a substitute for the bill I suppose that both will be printed together. I should like to have that done.

There being no objection, the bill and proposed substitute were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill (S. 3771) authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government.

Be it enacted, etc., That for the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, for the better utilization of resources and industries, and for the more effective exercise and more efficient administration by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief of the land and naval forces the President is hereby authorized to make such redistribution of functions among executive agencies as he may deem necessary, including any functions, duties, and powers hitherto by law conferred upon any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, office, or officer, in such manner as in his judgment shall seem best fitted to carry out the purposes of this act, and to this end is authorized to make such regulations and to issue such orders as he may deem necessary, which regulations and orders shall be in writing and shall be filed with the head of the department affected and constitute a public record: *Provided*, That this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for one year after the termination of the war by the proclamation of the treaty of peace, or at such earlier time during the said year as the President may designate: *Provided further*, That the termination of this act shall not affect any act done or any right or obligation accruing or accrued pursuant to this act and during the time that this act is in force: *Provided further*, That the authority by this act granted shall be exercised only in matters relating to the conduct of the present war.

SEC. 2. That in carrying out the purposes of this act the President is authorized to utilize, coordinate, or consolidate any executive or administrative commissions, bureaus, agencies, offices, or officers now existing by law, to transfer any duties or powers from one existing department, commission, bureau, agency, office, or officer to another, to transfer the personnel thereof or any part of it either by detail or assignment, together with the whole or any part of the records and public property belonging thereto.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act any moneys heretofore and hereafter appropriated for the use of any executive department, commission, bureau, agency, office, or officer shall be expended only for the purposes for which it was appropriated under the direction of such other agency as may be directed by the President hereunder to perform and execute said function.

SEC. 4. That should the President, in redistributing the functions among the executive agencies as provided in this act, conclude that any bureau should be abolished and it or their duties and functions conferred upon some other department or bureau or eliminated entirely, he shall report his conclusions to Congress, with such recommendations as he may deem proper.

SEC. 5. That all laws or parts of laws conflicting with the provisions of this act are to the extent of such conflict suspended while this act is in force.

Upon the termination of this act all executive or administrative agencies, departments, commissions, bureaus, offices, or officers shall exercise the same functions, duties, and powers as heretofore or as hereafter by law may be provided, any authorization of the President under this act to the contrary notwithstanding.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. SMITH of Georgia to the bill (S. 3771) authorizing the President to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices, and for other purposes, in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government, viz: Substitute for the report of the subcommittee the following:

SECTION 1. That for the national security and defense, for the successful prosecution of the war, for the support and maintenance of the Army and Navy, and for the more effective exercise and more efficient administration by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief of the land and naval forces the President is hereby authorized to make such redistribution of functions in and among the War and Navy Departments, the United States Shipping Board, the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, and the Bureau of Mines as he may deem necessary, including any functions, duties, and powers hitherto by law conferred upon such departments, board, corporation, or bureau, and upon bureaus, offices, or officers of the same, in such manner as in his judgment shall seem best fitted to carry out the purposes of this act, and to this end is authorized to make such regulations and to issue such orders as he may deem necessary: *Provided*, That such regulations and orders shall be in writing and given due publicity: *Provided further*, That this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for one year after the termination of the war by the proclamation of the treaty of peace, or at such earlier time during the said year as the President may designate: *Provided further*, That the termination of this act shall not affect any act done or any right or obligation accruing or accrued pursuant to this act and during the time that this act is in force.

SEC. 2. That in carrying out the purposes of this act the President is authorized, in and among the War and Navy Departments, the United States Shipping Board, the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, and the Bureau of Mines, to utilize, coordinate, or consolidate any bureaus, offices, or officers, to transfer any duties or powers from one existing bureau, office, or officer to another, and to transfer the personnel thereof, or any part of it, either by detail or assignment.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act any moneys heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the use of any such department, bureau, office, or officer shall be expended only for the purposes for which it was appropriated under the direction of such other agency as may be directed by the President hereunder to perform and execute said function.

SEC. 4. That upon the termination of this act all executive or administrative agencies, departments, commissions, bureaus, offices, or officers shall exercise the same functions, duties, and powers as heretofore or as hereafter by law may be provided, any authorization of the President under this act to the contrary notwithstanding.

SEC. 5. That all laws or parts of laws conflicting with the provisions of this act are to the extent of such conflict suspended while this act is in force.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I introduce a bill at the request of the War Department:

A bill (S. 4152) to authorize the acquisition by the United States during the period of the present war of private property of any and all kinds, real, personal, and mixed, needed for the national security and defense, or the conduct of the Government, to provide a method of such acquisition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 4153) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of free zones in the ports of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 4154) granting to the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bowdoin, Mont., for the benefit of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at Bowdoin, Mont., lots 12 and 13, in block 21, town site of Bowdoin, State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

A bill (S. 4155) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Stafford;

A bill (S. 4156) granting an increase of pension to Austin D. Bates;

A bill (S. 4157) granting an increase of pension to Daniel B. Grant (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4158) granting an increase of pension to Silas Wright;

A bill (S. 4159) granting an increase of pension to T. H. Reynolds (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4160) granting an increase of pension to A. M. Bennett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 4161) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Jones;

A bill (S. 4162) granting an increase of pension to Clara A. Thorp (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4163) granting a pension to Lawrence Fox (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4164) granting a pension to Ida F. Dillon (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 4165) granting a pension to Martha L. Cutler (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 4166) to amend section 3 of an act of Congress approved February 23, 1887 (vol. 24, Stat. L., chap. 210, p. 409), entitled "An act to provide for the execution of the provisions of article 2 of the treaty concluded between the United States of America and the Emperor of China on the 17th day of November, 1880, and proclaimed by the President of the United States on the 5th day of October, 1881;" to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 4167) granting a pension to George W. Parks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 4168) regulating and fixing the rank and compensation of the commissioned officers of the Medical Corps and of the Medical Reserve Corps of the United States Army while in active service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 4169) granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Murren (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. SHIELDS submitted an amendment providing that during the next fiscal year clerks in first and second class post offices shall receive increased compensation in addition to the compensation now received by them, at the rate of 20 per cent for all those receiving up to and including \$1,200 per annum, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for the maintenance of the United States Poultry Feeding and Breeding Experiment Station in the Salt River Valley, Ariz., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$500,000 for the purpose of encouraging stock industry and self-support among the Klamath Tribe of Indians, of Oregon, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

PUNISHMENT FOR ESPIONAGE.

Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 8753) to amend section 3, title 1, of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

OFFICERS' QUARTERS.

Mr. McNARY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3863) to provide quarters or commutation thereof to commissioned officers in certain cases, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

NONCOMBATANT COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The resolution (S. Res. 216) was read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested to transmit to the Senate the number of noncombatant commissioned officers in the United States Army within the draft age, and who have received their commissions since the outbreak of the war.

Mr. THOMAS. In this connection I present and ask to have inserted in the Record, without reading, an editorial relating to the subject from the Washington Post of yesterday morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLACKERS IN UNIFORM.

The astounding revelation, coming from an apparently reliable source, that there are 62,000 noncombatant officers holding commissions in the United States Army and but 63,000 combatant officers has aroused the

indignation of Senators and Representatives, who threaten an exposé in Congress, with a demand for an investigation of the facts in connection with the granting of commissions to this legion of nonfighting officers. There is no disposition to cast reflection upon the large number of men who, from patriotic motives, have sacrificed their personal interests and donned the uniform of their country in order that they may serve in the capacity in which they will be most useful, but there is a very strong inclination to put a stop to the granting of commissions through influence and to place an absolute ban upon the commissioning in the non-combatant forces of young men of draft age.

That it has been necessary in the quick expansion of the War Department organization to commission a large number of men from civil life is fully appreciated by all. There was no time for the training of staff officers, the training facilities of the country being exhausted in turning out the line officers necessary to command the National Army and the National Guard. But the inequalities that have crept in have become so glaring in many instances as to arouse a feeling of deep resentment. There have been numerous instances of young men who have gone through the grueling experiences of the officers' training camp and emerged with honor and a lieutenant's commission, only to find that some other man, specially favored, has stepped into a captaincy or majority without a day of training or any effort on his part. These incongruities naturally arouse feelings of resentment, which are not good for the morale of the Army.

It was announced as the fixed policy of the War Department that it would not grant a commission to any man of draft age unless it was found that his services were indispensable to the Government in the line for which he was commissioned. This policy, it is believed, has been adhered to in the great majority of cases. But it is stated that some conspicuous exceptions have been made, and these promise to be used as the theme for pointed remarks in Congress. It is difficult to conceive of any young man's services being so markedly useful to the United States as to justify an exception to this rule.

What particular ability must a young man have to warrant giving him shoulder straps with an officer's pay and allowances and an assignment to duty which keeps him permanently in this country, back of the lines, safe from enemy bullets or shrapnel, when millions of other men of the same age, many of them with equal or superior physical and mental equipment, are obliged to go out on the battle line and take the chances of war? It will require a very strong marshaling of argument to justify the commissioning of young men of draft age and assigning them to duty which involves no personal danger or even inconvenience.

If the mutterings heard in Congress mean anything, an investigation of such cases is impending, and it will be well for the Army and the country to have a probe of the circumstances surrounding the granting of commissions to civilians. It will result not only in weeding out those who may have secured their shoulder straps through influence or favoritism, but it also will vindicate those who are making a real and patriotic sacrifice in order to serve their Government. A little ray of light on the subject would be very helpful.

SHORTAGE OF COAL AND SUGAR.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement that to-morrow morning at the conclusion of the morning business, if I may obtain permission from the Senate, I wish to submit some remarks upon questions in connection with the investigation of coal and sugar. I am induced to this action by the speech of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], which was delivered some days ago.

THE NATION'S HEALTH.

Mr. OWEN. I ask to have sent to the Committee on Printing, with a view to having it printed as a Senate document, an address delivered before the Conservation Congress in Washington on "The Nation's Health," by Susanna Cocroft.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the act (S. 3752) to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes.

TIMBER FOR MILITARY PURPOSES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There are a number of bills on the calendar that have been reported by the Military Affairs Committee, most, if not all, of which were introduced at the request of the War Department, and it is quite important that some of them should be acted on speedily. I do not like to interfere with the pending measure, but I give notice now that at the first opportunity I shall ask unanimous consent that the several bills may be taken up and acted upon.

Mr. OVERMAN. We had better take them up now.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think probably the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina might be proper, to take them up now, and I ask unanimous consent that the bills may be considered, at least until the expiration of the morning hour. I think some of them will not require discussion. If so, those particular measures that would lead to any extended discussion might be postponed until a later date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. What bill would the Senator have taken up first?

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator has no objection, I would call his attention to the bill (S. 3426) to empower the President to requisition timber and timber products for war purposes. The bill was introduced and referred to the committee in the

Senator's absence. It was twice considered by the committee and finally reported.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I would just as soon take up that bill first if there is no objection.

Mr. SMOOT. As these bills are to be taken up I think Senators ought to be notified, so that if they have any objection they may be present, or if they desire to speak upon them they may have a chance to do so, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Nugent	Sutherland
Baird	Johnson, Cal.	Overman	Swanson
Bankhead	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Thomas
Beckham	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Thompson
Borah	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Tillman
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Ransdell	Townsend
Culberson	King	Reed	Trammell
Cummins	Kirby	Robinson	Underwood
Curtis	Lodge	Shafroth	Vardaman
Dillingham	McCumber	Sheppard	Walsh
Fletcher	McKellar	Sherman	Warren
France	McLean	Shields	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Hale	Martin	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Harding	Myers	Smith, Mich.	
Hardwick	Nelson	Smoot	
Henderson	New	Sterling	

Mr. WARREN. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. KENDRICK] on public business and ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. BECKHAM. I desire to announce that my colleague, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], is detained by illness.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. Goff] on account of illness. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. One of the most important bills is the bill (S. 3426) to empower the President to requisition timber and timber products for war purposes. It has more particular reference to the acquirement of spruce for use in the production of aircraft and timber for building of ships. As the Senate understands, there has been more or less difficulty in procuring spruce, which is absolutely necessary for aircraft construction. It is the object of the bill to enable the Government to take such steps as may be necessary to acquire spruce and lumber for ships in sufficient quantities to meet the Government's purpose.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, is this proceeding by unanimous consent?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent has already been granted.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], is this the bill which was referred back to the committee?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The bill was referred back to the committee and some amendments were made, after which the bill was finally reported by unanimous action of the committee.

Mr. BORAH. The bill is up for consideration now?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes.

The first amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 1, line 3, before the word "war," to strike out "in time of" and insert "during the period of the present," so as to make the clause read:

That during the period of the present war the President is hereby authorized and empowered within the limits of amounts heretofore or hereafter appropriated therefor—

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, line 8, after the word "Navy," to strike out "the United States Shipping Board," and on page 2, line 3, after the word "Navy," to strike out "the United States Shipping Board," so as to make the clause read:

First. To take possession of any standing or fallen timber required for use by the Army, Navy, or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, or required in the production of any article necessary for use by the Army, Navy, or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 6, after the word "lands," to insert "including Indian and military reservations," and in line 11, after the word "timber," to strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "to erect and maintain such machinery, appliances, and temporary structures upon any portion of said lands as may be necessary for the accomplishment of any of said purposes, and to remove the same; to

construct and maintain such roads and logging railroads across and over said lands as may be required for rapid cutting, removal, or appropriation of such timber, and to operate such logging railroads and remove all rails and equipment thereof," so as to make the clause read:

Second. To enter upon any lands, including Indian and military reservations, on which is situated any such standing or fallen timber so required, and to cut, remove, and appropriate such timber therefrom; also to enter upon and occupy any other lands or premises required in cutting or removing such standing or fallen timber; to erect and maintain such machinery, appliances, and temporary structures upon any portion of said lands as may be necessary for the accomplishment of any of said purposes, and to remove the same; to construct and maintain such roads and logging railroads across and over said lands as may be required for rapid cutting, removal, or appropriation of such timber, and to operate such logging railroads and remove all rails and equipment thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 21, after the word "products," to insert "and all machinery, cables, rails, equipment, and appliances of every character and description necessary for the production of logs, as may be"; in line 24, after the word "Navy," to strike out "the United States Shipping Board"; and on page 3, line 1, after the word "Corporation," to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That a reasonable supply of logs shall always be left with any mill conducting its own logging operations to insure its continued operation as a sawmill.

So as to make the clause read:

Third. To take possession of and use any logs or manufactured lumber or other timber products and all machinery, cables, rails, equipment, and appliances of every character and description necessary for the production of logs, as may be required for use by the Army, Navy, or the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation: Provided, That a reasonable supply of logs shall always be left with any mill conducting its own logging operations to insure its continued operation as a sawmill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 3, line 6, after the words "commit to," to strike out "the Secretary of War, to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the United States Shipping Board" and insert "a department or agency of the Government designated by him for that purpose," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That it shall be lawful for the President to commit to a department or agency of the Government designated by him for that purpose the exercise of the powers granted by section 1 hereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is agreed to, without objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before that amendment is agreed to I should like to hear from the Senator from Oregon, having this bill in charge, whether the purpose is to create another agency or instrumentality for the purpose of operating under the provisions of this bill? It seems to me we have already too many agencies and instrumentalities and boards, and that it would be far better to avail ourselves of some that are already in existence. I would be glad to have the Senator having this bill in charge, if he cares to answer, state what reason there is to justify the creation of another agency or board or bureau for the purpose of administering the duties required by this act?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think I can answer the Senator from Utah, if he will permit me. Probably that is proposed in order to make another necessity for a bill to authorize coordination.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will say in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri that, as I understand it, the intention of this proposed act is that the department or agency of the Government to be designated by the President is to perform these duties and that under this authority several such bodies might be consolidated into one.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the bill as it was originally prepared committed to the Secretary of War, to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the United States Shipping Board the duties imposed by the act, but it was thought best to establish some other agency—one agency, if need be—that could do this work with greater effectiveness than where it was divided among three different boards or departments.

I will say that this bill was recommitted because there was some difference of opinion amongst the men who were engaged in the production of lumber, particularly of spruce for aeroplane construction and of white pine and fir for the building of ships. After the bill was recommitted a hearing was had of the lumbermen of all sections of the country where these particular lumbers are produced. They were satisfied with the terms of the bill, I am advised, and many of the amendments which were made were made at their suggestion. I did not happen to be present at the time the hearing was had, on account of illness, but I believe the Senator from Florida [Mr.

FLETCHER] was present, and he knows just what was the reason for that particular change.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does this mean that we are to have a sawmill commission now?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It does not contemplate that there will be a sawmill commission.

Mr. HARDWICK. But will there not have to be some new authority created to perform this work?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It might be that the President would have the power under this legislation to name the chairman of the Shipping Board, or any particular individual, as an agency to attend to this particular part of the service.

Mr. BORAH. But he would have to name some agency already created.

Mr. HARDWICK. Is that really the case?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will state to the Senator from Georgia what the object of the amendment was. The question of getting timber was very important, not only for the Aircraft Board but for the Emergency Fleet Corporation in the building of ships. In one case, for instance, in Washington and Oregon, the Aircraft Board are particularly interested, and in the yellow-pine region the Emergency Fleet Corporation are particularly interested; so that it was thought advisable to have this legislation provide that the President might designate a particular agency, which is already a Government agency, to do this thing in one part of the country and another such agency to do it in another part of the country.

Mr. HARDWICK. I quite understand the desirability of that; but in order to accomplish that and no more, would the Senator object to this additional amendment—"any existing department or agency"—so that it will be certain that no new agency will be created?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I make a suggestion in answer to that question? Mr. President, the principal spruce districts in the country are in Oregon and Washington. I think the greater portion of spruce is produced there. It was a physical impossibility for the agents here in the city of Washington to undertake to get at these small bodies of spruce that were scattered throughout those two States. It was found that the agencies acting here in Washington could not reach it at all with any degree of efficiency. They did not understand the situation. It finally resulted in Col. Disque, an Army officer, being appointed as the agent of the Government to go out there and take charge of spruce production. For instance, in a single 40-acre tract of timber there might be only a few large trees that were spruce and that were suited for aircraft production. The man on the ground is the best agency employed to attend to it, and not men in Washington who do not understand conditions.

I will say to the Senator that the War Department has detailed enlisted men from Camp Meade to go into the lumber regions and get out this timber, because the I. W. W.'s would not allow men to go in there. It requires a man, an agency, on the ground to take charge of the production.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will pardon me, I did not object at all to that. What I want to do is not to provide for some new board. Let us allow the President to use any existing agency of the Government he wants to use in order to get this timber—whether in Oregon, in Georgia, in South Carolina, in Florida, or anywhere else—and let him employ an officer of the War Department, like the colonel the Senator has mentioned or some other man; but do not let us so provide that we will probably have a new sawmill board created as the result of this legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I have understood that Col. Disque, who is looking after the spruce supply in Oregon, has formed his force wholly out of enlisted men, and that by military authority they are seeking to acquire a supply of spruce timber for airplane construction.

Mr. HARDWICK. Be that as it may, we are using the War Department, then, in that particular matter; we are not creating at least a new and useless board.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. This was done by Col. Disque, however, under military authority. I think the Senator from Oregon is familiar with this work. I happen to be familiar with it, because the matter came up in the Committee on Commerce one day during a discussion of the labor problems that were affecting the timber supply for shipbuilding and for airplane construction; and it came out during that hearing that an officer of the Army was directing the timber supply so far as it related to Oregon, where we obtain most of our spruce timber for air-

plane construction. I think, however, I ought to say that in taking enlisted men into that service they are being paid wages that would ordinarily be paid to men in that field of labor, as they ought to be. If the work is not going along satisfactorily under the management of the officer it is not because he lacks authority. It was quite necessary that something drastic be undertaken in order to insure this supply.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that attached to the report is a telegram from Col. Disque which explains the situation and shows the necessity for this legislation?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I did not hear the amendment suggested by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. When the time comes, Mr. President, I intend to move to strike out the word "a," in line 7, of page 3, and substitute the words "any existing."

Mr. REED. "Agency?"

Mr. HARDWICK. That word will be left in. I desire to have it read "any existing department or agency of the Government."

Mr. REED. Does the Senator propose to make it in the singular or the plural?

Mr. HARDWICK. Just as it is, except I want to insert the word "existing" before the language the committee employs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to say just a few words about this bill. I think the agency ought to be an existing agency, but I think it ought to be a civilian agency.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that out in the sections where the I. W. W. are active it will be necessary to have some military authority.

Mr. REED. The military can go along with the civil. I am talking about the requisitioning authority. I do not know what kind of conditions may prevail in some parts of the country. The Senator speaks of the I. W. W. I did not suppose there was a place in the United States where the civil authority had been superseded by mobs or by unlawful organizations.

Mr. BORAH. Well, there are instances where troops had to be called on.

Mr. REED. I am perfectly willing that the civil agents may be backed by any amount of power necessary. I want to call attention to a circumstance—

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me just a moment before he gets away from that point, I wish to suggest that, if we are getting the timber for the War Department or for the Navy Department, it might be just as well to permit an agency of those departments to be employed in getting the timber. Therefore I would not want to limit them in the way the Senator suggests. I would say "any agency of the Government already existing that the President wants to employ."

Mr. REED. I desire simply to relate one circumstance; there are several of them, but I will relate only one. An old farmer in my State who has lived on the same piece of land—he and his ancestors—for probably 75 years, among other things has nursed and kept on this splendid farm a walnut grove, in which there are many fine trees. It was a matter of great pride to him. Something like eight or nine months ago a couple of gentlemen arrived at his place, who had with them a man wearing the uniform of an Army lieutenant. They told this old farmer they had come down to buy his timber; that it was his patriotic duty to sell it. They intimated to him very broadly that, if he did not sell it, it would be taken from him; and that any man who did not turn over his timber was a bad citizen, if not a traitor. The old gentleman was greatly alarmed and greatly distressed. He said, "I am perfectly willing to give my walnut timber to the Government to make gunstocks with; I will give it to the Government if the Government wants it; but I should like to know the authority you gentlemen have to come here and demand it." They continued to deliver lectures to him; but he is a pretty game sort of an old American, and finally he said to them, "Now, I want to know whether you are here representing the United States Government and want this timber for the United States Government; and if so, I want to see your authority." Finally he forced the admission from them that they wanted this timber to sell to somebody who they said had an Army contract. Some of these trees were worth \$200 apiece. The same thing that was attempted in this instance and that failed, because this old gentleman was a pretty sturdy character, was attempted in other places.

I want the Government of the United States to have the fullest authority to take timber where it is necessary; but I believe the authority ought to be lodged in some civil officer of the Government; it ought not to be lodged in the military. I am perfectly willing, of course, after the civil authority has taken action, that, if necessary, force shall be used to take the timber. I think the amendment of the Senator from Georgia is a good

amendment; but if this is to be done through a war agency, I want to offer another amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Just a suggestion, Mr. President.

In the getting out of spruce there has been very great difficulty encountered on account of the activities of the I. W. W.'s in the western country. I do not know that they were guilty of any particular overt acts, either in the destruction of life or the destruction of property; but conditions got to be such in Oregon and part of Washington, at least, that men were afraid to go into the timber to work. It was all a man's life was worth to leave his home and go into the lumber camps for the purpose of getting out lumber that was to be used for governmental purposes. In order to meet that situation—and this is in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri that he prefers to have a civilian agency—it became necessary to send an Army officer out there, in the person of Col. Disque, and to detail enlisted men from Camp Meade into the lumber camps with guns on their shoulders, to see to it that nobody interfered with the work.

This was a benefit to these young enlisted men. They went into these camps armed and uniformed, if you please, as United States soldiers. They never had to use the guns, but their presence there maintained order.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I do not object to that. I do not object to the necessary force being employed to guard the men who propose to take the timber. What I am suggesting is in response to the statement that was made here that the board that requisitions this timber ought to be a civil board; it ought to be the civil authority that is employed; and if there is resistance, then, of course, the necessary power can be used.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Completing what I had to say, Mr. President, this was not only of benefit to the Government itself, but it was of benefit to these young enlisted men. They went into these camps and they got paid for their services just what the men working in the lumber camps got. They got the standard wages. We have not had any trouble with the I. W. W.'s or any other of that element since these young men went into the field.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator also, by way of strengthening his idea—because I agree with him about it—that if the War Department themselves want this timber, they may want a certain kind that they can get better than anybody else. Why should they not be allowed to send out their own officials to get it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Let me say this to the Senator: The Senator has not had occasion, of course, to go into this situation. Here is the Shipping Board, that want one class of timber. They want the fir and white pine. They require timber of a certain size. They were not acting in conjunction with the Aircraft Production Board. They had their agencies there looking after fir production. The Aircraft Board had an agency—a civilian agency, if you please—looking after the production of spruce. After a good deal of negotiation and a good deal of work some of us succeeded in getting the Aircraft Production Board and the Shipping Board to get together. I think Mr. Bloedel, of Seattle, was named by the Shipping Board as its civilian representative on this board, and a gentleman from Oregon, another civilian, was suggested as the representative of the Aircraft Production Board, and there are others on this board, so that both of these boards are now acting together. If you limit this to an existing agency, as the Senator from Georgia proposes, I question very much if the Aircraft Production Board or the Shipping Board could go to work and select civilians to try to work in harmony in getting out both fir for ship production and spruce for aircraft production. That is the purpose of this.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for just a moment, does the Senator then contend that under this language an absolutely new board or commission could be created by the President?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is not the creation of a commission, but—

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, could be employed, then, I will say?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I question very much if these different branches of the Government—the Aircraft Production Board and the Shipping Board—would have the right to name these civilians who are offering their services for the purpose of assisting in this work.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, under the discretionary power residing in the President, and with a fund absolutely at his disposal, they could do exactly what the Senator from Georgia says.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Well, it is barely possible that that might be done; but this bill was prepared after a good deal of

effort and a good deal of consideration by the Aircraft Production Board as well as the Shipping Board, and we have changed it and modified it so as to meet the opposing views of each.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not mean to criticize that feature of the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In order to avoid further discussion, Mr. President, so far as I can do it, I am willing to accept the one amendment the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] proposes.

Mr. HARDWICK. I hope the Senator will do so.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I think that language would be entirely satisfactory, and I really think that was the purpose of the committee.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is what you meant.

Mr. FLETCHER. It was not our intention to create a new or additional agency.

Mr. HARDWICK. I suggest that amendment, then, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee, in his opening statement with reference to the bill, made a remark that I understood to mean that the necessity for this bill largely grows out of the needs of the Government to get spruce for airplanes. I want to ask him whether or not he meant by that that legislation of this kind is necessary, so far as the Pacific coast is concerned, in order to get the timber from the owners?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It is; and I will state to the Senator why. As the Senator knows, coming from the State of Washington, spruce is scattered over a large area. For instance, in a 40-acre tract—

Mr. JONES of Washington. But the Senator does not get my point.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Yes; I think I will answer the Senator. There are a number of small tracts of land covered by spruce, the owners of which are scattered or unknown. The original owners in some cases are dead. The parties who are in control of it are willing that the Government should take off the spruce, but the owners of it are so scattered that it is impossible for the Government to get action on it, even at the request of the men who appear to be in control.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That explains the situation from the viewpoint of the Senator, and probably there may be some conditions like that; but I want to say that the lumber people of the Pacific coast have assured me that they have placed their timber at the disposal of the Government absolutely, upon any terms that the Government may desire, and that it is not necessary to give the administration or administrative officers authority to commandeer timber because of the refusal of the owners to let the Government have it.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I was told, with reference to this bill, that there are some sections of the country where the owners of timber are refusing to let the Government have their timber, and that this legislation might be necessary because of the situation in those sections of the country; but I want to say that, so far as the lumber people of the Pacific coast are concerned, this legislation is not necessary to get them to let the Government take their timber. They are all glad and willing to let the Government have it upon whatever terms it may fix. Of course, the difficulty disclosed by what the Senator has just mentioned may exist with reference to some tracts.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him for a moment, if the Senator will read the telegram from Col. Disque which is part of the report on this bill, he will find that Col. Disque corroborates what the Senator says about the willingness of the great majority of the timber owners to let the Government have whatever it wants; but I call the Senator's attention to that telegram. He says:

At request of Hammond Lumber Co. permit me to say that Chamberlain's commandeering bill is not made necessary because of attitude of timber owners in Washington and Oregon who are operating at the present time. I have had nothing but most patriotic support from the great majority. Necessity for bill lies in the fact that considerable spruce timber is held by absent owners—sometimes in direction enemy sympathizers, sometimes estates and ownership involved in court proceedings, and sometimes we can not locate owners. These are the reasons why this bill should become a law at once. In addition, frequently stands in Indian reservations and military reservations are tied up by restrictive laws which seem impossible to overcome. When our operations are directed through a given territory it is mandatory in the interest of our war program that we proceed with rapidity to take all the spruce as we go. The patriotic action of employers and employees, as well as owners of timber present in this section, has been beyond question, and I know of none who oppose this bill, which should not be considered as a coercive measure as regards those who are at present in the lumber business in the Northwest.

There is quite a considerable body of that class of timber, as Col. Disque explained to me personally, which he could not

reach at all, and it was absolutely essential for the Government's use.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator means he could not reach the owners.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I am glad the Senator has read that telegram. When this bill was reported some little time ago, I received telegrams from a number of people in my State suggesting that they ought to have an opportunity to be heard. I spoke to the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], who reported the bill, and I think it was at my request that the bill was sent back to the committee. I did not, in fact, know that the bill had been reported again. I have not had time to examine it and have not had time to examine the report which the Senator has read, but that telegram coincides with the information I have had, and I wanted to emphasize that.

Now, I want to say just a word or two.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. While the Senator is on his feet, I wish he would tell the Senate whether the lumbermen in his part of the country have been fully informed as to the nature of this bill and have been heard before the committee, and whether they are satisfied with it?

I ask that question for this reason: Minnesota is not a large lumber-producing State any more, but very many of her citizens are interested in Washington and Oregon, on the Pacific coast. I have heard nothing from them, but I am very sure that, so far as my State is concerned, the lumber there belonging to Minnesota owners is at the disposal of the Government on its own terms. I have never heard anything about this bill, and I should like to know whether the lumber interests have been informed as to the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, it was at the request of lumber people from my State that I asked the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to have the bill recommitted, in order that they might have a hearing. I understand that representatives of the lumber industry from the State were here, and they appeared before the committee, and they have had their hearing, and none of them has spoken to me since the hearing was had. I understand that they have gone home. My impression is that they are satisfied with the measure as amended; that is, they are willing to accept cheerfully whatever is deemed necessary, even though they may doubt the wisdom of it.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say, if the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, that there did appear before the committee representatives of the lumber interests from the Pacific coast and from the Gulf coast and from the Atlantic coast, and the committee agreed to the amendments which they desired to have made to the bill.

One objection urged to the bill was that it probably would give some sort of control over the operation of the mills. That was not the purpose. The main purpose is to get timber in suitable sizes for building ships and suitable sizes for carrying on the aircraft work. This necessity arises not because the people who own the timber are unpatriotic or want to hold up the Government, or anything of that kind, but frequently the timber is owned by people who are away and can not be reached. Sometimes it is owned by minors, sometimes by estates, sometimes by trustees who can not sell. Sometimes it is under mortgage and can not be released, and it is not available to the Government. On the other hand, we need the timber; we need these sizes; and this power is given to commandeer the timber in the woods, the logs; not to operate sawmills. That was not the purpose, and we do not attempt to go into that field at all. So that the bill was amended in accordance with the wishes of the gentlemen to whom the Senator refers and others who appeared before the committee, and, so far as I know now, there is no objection whatever on the part of anybody to the passage of the bill as it has been amended.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I want to ask him one question about what this bill means.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will not the Senator defer that for a moment?

Mr. HARDWICK. Has the Senator from Washington still the floor? I do not want to interfere with the Senator if he has the floor.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have just a few more words to say.

Mr. HARDWICK. All right.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I will say, Mr. President, that my understanding is, and my recollection of the terms of the bill

as originally introduced is, that it did give control over sawmills, and everything of that kind. This just illustrates what the trouble is with the legislation that comes down to Congress. With the purpose of the legislation everybody can agree; but the trouble is that those who frame the legislation not only try to carry out a particular purpose, but they put within the terms of the bill all sorts of authority outside of and beyond the purpose that is intended to be served by the measure.

Mr. HARDWICK. That is exactly what I had in mind, Mr. President. If the Senator will yield to me, perhaps I can get from him the information that I desire. I see that section 4 of the bill provides as follows:

That the President is hereby authorized, during the period of the present war, * * * to issue orders to persons engaged in lumbering and in operating sawmills prescribing the dimensions of lumber and timber products which shall be manufactured in the course of such operations.

Taking that entire section and construing it together, does the Senator from Washington believe that under this bill the President can generally direct the operation of sawmills and prescribe what lengths and dimensions of lumber shall be sawed throughout this country, whether it is intended for war purposes or not?

Mr. JONES of Washington. That language sounds pretty broad. As I said awhile ago, I have not had an opportunity to read the bill since it was reported by the committee.

Mr. HARDWICK. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida, then—

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator may ask some one in charge of the bill about that.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator from Florida, then, give me the information he has in answer to that question? The question I ask is this: Under this bill, and particularly under section 4 of it, is the President limited, in the orders that he may issue to sawmills as to the kind and character and length and breadth of their output, to such necessities as the Government may have with relation to war, or is he generally to have a supervisory control over all sawmill operations in this country?

Mr. FLETCHER. Why, Mr. President, the effort distinctly was to avoid anything of that sort; that is, the general control over sawmills or the power to make any rules or regulations respecting the operation of sawmills. The bill refers to the necessities of the Army, the Navy, and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation. At the beginning of section 4 it specifies that the President is authorized to do these things "in so far as may be necessary to insure an adequate supply of lumber and timber products required by the Army, Navy, and the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation." The language in the original bill, "the manner of conducting all logging and lumbering operations," was stricken out by the committee, because it was feared that that might give the broad power that the Senator suggests. That was eliminated, and as the bill is now reported that language is out of it.

Mr. HARDWICK. To get that construction plainly before the Senate, then, as the committee understands it, the contention is that the President is given this power to direct the operation of sawmills only in so far as it is necessary to secure what this country needs for war purposes?

Mr. FLETCHER. Precisely; precisely.

Mr. HARDWICK. I wanted to be informed on that.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. REED. But the bill does not say that.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. It refers to that kind of operation, and the only operation authorized is the operation to secure the necessary timber for the purposes named.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Washington has the floor, and I will not interfere with him.

Mr. JONES of Washington. It was brought out before the Commerce Committee on the hearing in reference to the operation of the Shipping Board some time ago that there was one man out on the Pacific coast representing the Shipping Board in getting out the timber for building the ships; that there was another man representing the War Department getting out material for certain war purposes connected with the War Department; and that there was somebody else looking after the airplane production. Now, a system like that can result only in waste and delay and confusion.

It has never seemed to me that it was outside of the power of the departments to coordinate their efforts along those lines. It seems that there is hardly any occasion comes up but what it must be met by the creation of some new board or the giving of new authority or the employment of new agencies in order to accomplish what it would seem we have agencies enough to accomplish. But if we have not the authority to concentrate the power in one body to look after all those various interests, then we ought to grant it; and the sooner it is granted the better it will be.

It is absolutely essential to avoid waste and to avoid great loss to the lumber industry that this authority should be centralized so that one controlling body or person may supervise the getting out of timber for these various operations so as to use and conserve the timber that must be cut in order to get out the timber that we need for these particular purposes and that will be wasted unless some provision is made to take care of it. With a proper control and with a proper handling of the matter, not only can the Government get out what it needs but conserve what we must necessarily have cut after what is needed by the Government is taken.

The Senator from Oregon referred to the activities of the Industrial Workers of the World in that section of the country. In the last few days I have seen people from our section of the country, and while we have thought that that condition was very much under control the indications now are that it is likely to break out this spring and this summer as bad, if not worse, than it was before. There is a situation there which should be met, and it should be met promptly, and it should be met vigorously by the administration. The military power should be used, so far as it is possible to use it, in order to suppress this agency and this evil that is doing more in the Northwest to hinder and delay the operations of the Government than anything else.

We hear a great deal now about spies in this country. You hardly pick up a paper but you find a reference to spies, and statements that the country is filled with spies. Government officials warn us against spies and intimate that they are on every corner. If there are spies anything like what the papers would indicate, why are not the agencies of the Government doing their duty in catching some of them, and when they are caught there ought to be some drastic punishment meted out to them. If there are spies here, we ought to catch them and we ought to try them promptly by court-martial, and if found guilty we ought to mete out to them the punishment that has always been meted out to spies in time of war—they should be shot. If we do that, we will get rid of some of the spies anyhow, and the others will not do much at their nefarious work.

The same drastic methods will have to be used with the Industrial Workers of the World. A gentleman came from my State just a few days ago who told me of an incident that occurred a few weeks ago at Aberdeen, Wash. He stated that a great spruce log was taken into one of the lumber mills to be sawed up into lumber for airplanes. The great belt saw began to turn, the log moved forward, and the saw broke into a thousand pieces. It had run against an iron hasp that had been driven into the log before it was brought there. This not only ruined the saw, damaged the log, but delayed the work several days and endangered the lives of the workmen. So it is that our laboring people are really afraid to work about the sawmills. They are afraid of things like this that endanger their lives at any moment of time.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not say that anybody is derelict in not finding out a thing like that, but such conditions should spur the administration and the agencies of the Government to do everything in their power to stop and suppress anything of that sort, especially when it affects the war activities of the Government. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Along the line of the information which the Senator has just been giving us I would like also to refer to what occurred at Covington, Ky., the other day when 600 horses belonging to the Government were poisoned.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I noticed in yesterday morning's paper a little dispatch down in one corner of the paper from the little city in which I lived for over 25 years. It stated that the people of Yakima had taken the secretary of the Industrial Workers of the World local about a mile out of town and had tarred and feathered him.

Mr. President, that is as peace loving and as peaceable a community as there is in the country, but the people of the localities in that section are getting desperate and they propose to take the law into their own hands unless something is done to suppress this evil that is traitorous in its conduct and most disastrous in its effect. I hope that the Government agencies will increase their efforts to suppress and eradicate these terrible evils that are threatening the very success of our armies and of our arms. Most drastic and radical methods will have to be used.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator tell me why the people of Oregon and the people of Washington and the people of California can not take that matter into their own hands if the Government is engaged in other matters requiring all its attention. There is power in the State to deal with it. There is manhood enough in those States to

deal with it. I should like to have the Senator tell me why it is not dealt with.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES of Washington. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. It is a pretty difficult situation to meet in a community without a National Guard or militia or without an army—without anyone to deal with the situation. I am very much of the opinion of the able Senator. I really know from actual, physical contact with the I. W. W. that they are about as elusive a proposition and at the same time as destructive a proposition as you ever ran up against, and it is almost impossible to deal with them unless you have a regular military force with which to operate. It should be remembered that these are not law-abiding laborers who may be dissatisfied with their wage, but they are a lawless class.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me answer the Senator right here. I have had no occasion myself to come into physical contact with the I. W. W., but the people of my State have had opportunity to exercise their vigilance upon this class of American traitors. I will not call them American traitors, because most of them probably are foreigners. In a little town of only about four or five thousand, a year or two ago, in my State, some 600 of them congregated. They were ordered to leave. They refused. They were arrested. They refused to work. There were so many of them that there were not jails enough to take care of them, but within two days there was an organization of farmers who came to town with their shotguns, and they gave the orders for those people to leave—and they did not buy them any tickets, either—and they left. I have no doubt but that the people of the States of Oregon and California can deal with them in the same way. They got out, and they did not come back, and if they had come back there would have been a great many funerals in that part of the State.

Mr. BORAH. North Dakota evidently ran them out into some other State. All they did was to put them across the State line.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then let the next State drive them away.

Mr. BORAH. That does not solve the question at all. If the 600 men of whom the Senator speaks had been scattered over a vast area of country—timberland and forests, and so forth—as large, perhaps, as North Dakota itself, it would have been almost impossible to deal with the situation. You might have driven a few of them out, as we have driven them into Senator Jones's State sometimes from Idaho, and into Montana, but it does not solve the situation. It must be taken charge of and taken possession of, and they must be given a trial and punished.

Mr. McCUMBER. The organization should be destroyed, and you can do that.

Mr. BORAH. You can not destroy the organization. That is an intangible proposition. It is something that you can not get at. You can not reach it. You do not know where it is. It is not in writing. It is not in anything else. It is a simple understanding between men, and they act upon it without any evidence of existence whatever.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Some of them—secretaries and several others—have been arrested and dealt with. The Federal authority, of course, can not catch a man and hang him by law on suspicion.

Mr. BORAH. Another thing. The system which the Senator from North Dakota speaks of might work in one particular instance, but it would not be conducive to law and order or to the protection of human life if adopted generally throughout the country; and certainly we have not reached the point in this war or in this country where we can not in an orderly way take into custody a violator of law and punish him according to the law, and that, so far as I am concerned, I want my State to do and insist upon it doing. I do not want mob law even against the I. W. W.

Mr. McCUMBER. If the Senator from Washington will allow me just a moment, I want to take the very last sentence of the Senator, that we have not reached the condition in this country in which we can not in a regular and orderly method deal with these people. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] in opening his address upon this bill this morning used this language:

But conditions got to be such in Oregon and parts of Washington, at least, that men were afraid to go into the timber to work. It was all a man's life was worth to leave his home and go into the lumber camps for the purpose of getting out lumber that was to be used for governmental purposes.

If what the Senator from Oregon states is correct, it seems to me that we are not able to deal with this situation in an orderly way, and if we have not sufficient officials to subserve the interests and the demands of the peace-loving part of our

population, then I say that we are justified in doing exactly what the frontiersmen have had to do in many instances, organize their defense forces and destroy the criminals.

Mr. BORAH. I do not care to make a personal reference, but I have had some experience with these people. There is always a class in a community that want to take the law into their own hands. To my mind that is just another form of I. W. W.'s. That is their principal doctrine, their theory of force, and it resolves itself into a question of who can exert the greater force.

The best administration that you can possibly give to the I. W. W. organization is to demonstrate that the Government itself is strong enough and efficient enough to prosecute them and prosecute them under the law. If you appeal to brute force or to mob force, it does not accomplish anything in the way of exterminating them at all. It simply drives them into another community for the time. But when they become satisfied that law can take hold of them and prosecute them under the law to success and punish them under the law, it inspires in them a respect for government which has its effect.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator does not disagree with me at all. I believe in using the ordinary processes of law if they can be used, but if we have reached a condition in which we can not protect the lives of the citizens and in which we can not protect the interests of the Government in a great war, then I certainly believe in taking whatever steps are necessary to accomplish the purpose of subserving the interests of the people and protecting the Government.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator and I only disagree in one thing apparently. The Senator seems to think that mob violence is all right to be used against a mob. I utterly disagree with the doctrine. I do not believe that is the way to deal with the situation at all. I believe that we should proceed under the law and in an orderly way and prosecute them and deal with them under the law and not by mob violence. I do not want to see the people—

Mr. McCUMBER. I agree with the Senator entirely if you can do it, but you have presented here a situation that has got beyond the control of the people themselves and the law-abiding section of the country.

Mr. BORAH. I do not concede that at all. I do not say it has got beyond their control. I say there are certain forces of the Government which are necessary to deal with it, and that when they are called into action they can deal with it effectively, orderly, and under the law.

Mr. McCUMBER. We have not dealt with them, Mr. President. We have not dealt with them for a year now that we have been preparing for this war. They have checked the production of timber necessary for ships. They have systematically prevented the efficiency of labor in the construction of ships upon which the very life of the Nation depends and we have not been able, or at least we have not so far, to control them sufficiently to produce what we ought to produce for the use of the Government.

Mr. BORAH. I agree with the Senator that we have not controlled them, but I do not agree that we have not been able to do so had we gone about it in a proper way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho, before he takes his seat, if he does not think that it is incumbent upon the State government to take action in the matter.

Mr. BORAH. Undoubtedly it is incumbent upon the State, and what I say is that the State is left now without any home guard or any National Guard or any militia, and they have no means by which to deal with it as effectively as they would otherwise do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that, but the State has the power in dealing with anything that takes the proportions of a mob or insurrection to call on the Federal Government for the military to execute the State decrees or the decrees of the State court.

Mr. BORAH. That is one of the ways in which I believe it may be done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the way in which it should be done.

One more thing. A great many things have been done by these people not in the shape of insurrection and mobs at all. It is sabotage, as they call it, driving nails into timber, and all that sort of thing, all of which are punishable under State criminal laws.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But none are punishable under Federal law unless you can connect it with espionage or with treason.

Mr. BORAH. Of course the State law must administer the punishment, and after policing the situation or controlling the situation may call for the aid of the Federal Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It may, and whenever it does it is incumbent upon the State authorities to ask the Federal Government for that aid. Of course the sheriff has, in the first place, the right to call upon the entire population of the county, or wherever his jurisdiction is, to help him execute the law, and you can avoid the mob effect by simply having the sheriff summon all the good citizens. They cease to be a mob then. Let them get their shotguns and deal with these people to whom I have had reference, and if they find the sheriff, with a posse comitatus, is not able to do it, then there comes an appeal to the military.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I do not want to be understood as advocating that the National Government shall interfere with or supplant the administration of the State law; but I did want to emphasize the situation that confronts us in the Northwest, and I am glad to have it emphasized in the views stated by the different Senators. As the Senator from Idaho said, our militia is all gone and there is no authority there of a military character that we can call upon, unless the sheriff will call upon the governor and the governor call upon the National Government. That was done last year. The governor called upon the National Government and the National Government acted promptly and sent troops out there, and the I. W. W. faded away just like frost before the morning sun. We heard nothing more of them. Finally the troops were taken out and the bad situation seems to be returning. We found this difficulty in some places, with reference to the National Government: As I went out home I went through Wenatchee, in the fruit section, and the National Government had arrested a whole lot of I. W. W.'s and had turned them over to the sheriff to hold for them, and they were in the jail, and they were almost tearing the jail down. They paid no attention to the sheriff. They had no respect for the local authorities. He turned the hose on them, and that only stopped them for a little while.

The sheriff finally insisted upon some member of the home guard being sent there, and, without authority from higher authority, the captain of the home guard sent two or three men up to this jail. The I. W. W.'s happened to look out and saw a man walking along there in uniform, and one said to another, "Why, the soldiers are here," and they stopped their noise immediately and their tearing at the jail and all that sort of thing. They have the greatest respect for the uniform.

Mr. NELSON. Not respect, but fear.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; they have fear; the Senator from Minnesota is right. It is not respect; it is abject fear of the uniform.

The sheriff had been trying to get the Federal authorities to take these men off his hands and prosecute them, if they were to be prosecuted, and punish them, if they were to be punished; but he could not get them to do it; they would not do it. I know he told me that day that unless they did take these men by the next day he would turn them loose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Had these men violated the laws of the State or of the Federal Government?

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Mississippi asks whether these men had violated the laws of the State or of the Federal Government. I do not know; but I do know that they had been arrested by the authority of the Federal Government. What the charge was I do not know. They were not held by the local authorities for violating any State law, but they were held by the Federal authorities for alleged violation of some Federal law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It seems to me, from the very fact that they were surrendered to the State authorities, that the people who had arrested them and in whose minds suspicion of their guilt had been aroused, thought they had violated a State law.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They were not surrendered to the State authorities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They were surrendered to the sheriff?

Mr. JONES of Washington. They were simply placed in his charge as a representative of the Federal Government. They were not turned over to him as a county official or as a sheriff.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It seems to me if they had violated the laws of the Federal Government they ought to have been turned over to the United States marshal.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Of course, they should have been, but—

Mr. WILLIAMS. They could then, in the ordinary way, have found custody for them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. But there was no marshal there, and there was no deputy marshal there. The marshal was 150 miles away at Spokane. The sheriff did try to get the United States marshal to take these men off his hands, but he would not do it, but said, "Hold them; keep them there." That ought

not to have been done. As the Senator from Mississippi has suggested, the sheriff had authority to call upon every citizen of the community to help him enforce the law, and I hope that our county and State officials will do that, but I want the co-operation also of the National Government, especially in connection with the operations of the National Government. The presence of Federal troops around the various activities of the National Government will have a very salutary effect upon these people. It will do much toward preventing these nefarious practices.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, it may not have a bearing upon this bill, but as the question has been discussed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], I wish to say that I substantially agree with those Senators.

In times of peace, of course, the State is going to maintain order through its governor and county officials, and prosecute all crimes within the borders of the State, but there are some things which State governments can not do in time of war. When this war broke out the Legislature of Minnesota made a large appropriation and appointed a public safety commission of eminent personnel, not only to maintain order but to do everything that was necessary in the State to make most effective the State resources for the purposes of this war. But the militia had been ordered away from the State, and, consequently, the State was compelled to provide a State guard, by legislative act, which involved the drilling and preparation of the men composing the State guard in order that they might be fit for service, all of which took time. Seventy-five per cent of the ore which is used in the manufacture of steel in this country goes through the Soo Canal, and about 70 per cent passes through the ports of Duluth and Allouez Bay. All private property in that section had to be protected, embracing docks, lines, and the Soo Canal. A blast of dynamite would absolutely have stopped the ore production of this country, and this section was at that time infested with I. W. W.'s. Some of them were undoubtedly traitors and spies. There was every indication of that. The only thing they were afraid of was a Federal uniform. They did not respect the civil authorities, the sheriff of the county, or an ordinary policeman. The harbors had to be patrolled. As the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] stated, the State of Minnesota could have driven them from their harbors, perhaps over into Wisconsin, but nothing would have been accomplished.

While, of course, it is not the duty of the Federal Government to preserve order in the States and to enforce State laws, or ordinarily to use the Army and the Navy to protect private property, yet in time of war it is necessary to do everything to maintain the resources of the Nation. The mines, docks, and the canals were absolutely necessary, and if they had been destroyed the industries of this country would have been paralyzed. Men, of course, should not be convicted under mob law without trial, either in time of war or at any other time, and therefore the Government in time of war should be called upon to preserve order in some instances where a State is unable to do so.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, in the discussion so far it seems to have been taken for granted that this bill deals only with lumber and logs that are to be used by sawmills. It seems to me that the provisions of the bill are very much broader than that, and that it can apply to lumber and logs that are to be used for any purpose whatever. In my State a great deal of the spruce is used in the pulp mills. I should, therefore, like to ask the Senator from Florida whether the pulp manufacturers of the East have been heard from on this question?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], I will say that I never heard that the pulp manufacturers desired to present their views. We had before us people who were interested in timber and in the manufacture of lumber—the sawmill people and the logging people—and they were the only ones who seemed to be concerned in this matter at all. I do not think there is any sort of proposal here to deal with timber that is used for making pulp.

Mr. HALE. I do not agree with the Senator from Florida as to that. The same kind of timber that is used in sawmills in my State is also used for manufacturing pulp.

Mr. FLETCHER. The whole subject came up by reason of the difficulty of getting timber of sufficient size for building ships and also timber of such dimensions as was needed for the building of aircraft. It has nothing to do with pulp timber.

Mr. HALE. That may be very true, but I think the Senator will agree that under the provisions of this bill the Government would have the right to take timber of any kind or description whatsoever.

Mr. FLETCHER. Only for the use of the Army, the Navy, and the Emergency Fleet Corporation.

Mr. HALE. Precisely.

Mr. FLETCHER. Where does the Army or the Navy need to deal with pulp?

Mr. HALE. The Army or the Navy may need a supply of spruce timber for whatever purpose that may be necessary, and in such case they might take it from the pulp manufacturers as well as from anybody else. There is a provision of the bill as follows:

Provided, That a reasonable supply of logs shall always be left with any mill conducting its own logging operations to insure its continued operation as a sawmill.

I see no reason why there should not be another provision inserted to the effect that a sufficient number of logs may be left for the pulp mills to conduct their business.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is more important, I think, that we should have timber with which to build ships than it is that we should have timber out of which to make pulp. We have got to have these ships and we have got to have these aeroplanes.

Mr. NEW addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HALE. I should like to make a further statement.

Within a short time we had a joint resolution before us, which the Senate rejected, proposing to allow the Government to take control of the print-paper manufacturing business of the country. I think we ought to be very careful to know that in this apparently innocent bill the same power is not given to the Government now.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. NEW. I will simply say, for the information of the Senator from Maine, that I am personally acquainted with some of the witnesses who appeared at the hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs. While they are not directly connected with the pulp industry, they are collaterally associated, to my knowledge, with parties who are interested in the pulp production in Michigan and the Central West. From their relations to those people, it is a matter of inference wholly on my part that the pulp paper men were advised of the merits of the bill, and, so far as my knowledge goes, no request came from any of them for a hearing.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. NEW. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I merely want to ask the Senator from Indiana what possible difference it could make whether they had any objection or not, because the only thing this bill does is to give the Government machinery to commandeer lumber and timber that it needs for military purposes for the prosecution of this war? And if that is all it does, it ought to have that power, no matter what other interests it touches or affects.

Mr. NEW. That is true.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to the same section to which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] referred a few moments ago, and to express a view different from that announced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. In examining the bill very hastily—and I suppose none of us have seen it, except the members of the committee, until it was presented to the Senate a few moments ago—it occurred to me that section 4 grants power and authority that the committee did not desire to confer upon the President or the agency hereby created, and power not necessary for the stated purpose of the bill. Section 4 authorizes the President to issue and enforce orders to persons engaged in logging operations, prescribing the length of logs which shall be cut in the course of such operations, and to issue orders to persons engaged in lumbering and in operating sawmills, prescribing the dimensions of lumber and timber products which shall be manufactured in the course of such operations.

The next section provides a penal clause and makes a violation of any of the orders of the President or the provisions of the act a misdemeanor, and the offender may be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or be both fined and imprisoned. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the fair interpretation to be placed upon section 4 is that the agency to be created by the bill may prescribe the dimensions of all timber cut by mills and all timber products manufactured in any plants operating in the United States. While the intention may be to limit the section to those firms or persons who have contracted with the Government, the language employed is not free from ambiguity. I think there is room for the contention that all

lumber plants will be placed under the control of a governmental agency.

There is a growing disposition to place all business under national supervision. Some unwise persons seem to think that whatever the Government or some petty agent of the Government touches it so instantly becomes sacred and success is assured. Our experience demonstrates that governmental operations are costly and usually inefficient. I should be opposed to the Government taking over the sawmills and timber plants of the country, and I am opposed to enacting penal statutes to aid in controlling private enterprise.

Mr. HARDWICK. It is limited, however, if the Senator will pardon me, by this language:

In so far as it may be necessary to insure an adequate supply of lumber and timber products required by the Army, Navy—

And so forth. They would not have the right to do any of the things subsequently outlined in that section, unless it was necessary to do them in order to supply the Army and the Navy. That is a reasonable view, and I am very much inclined to oppose large grants of power.

Mr. KING. If I were sure that the construction placed upon this section by the Senator from Georgia were the only one that would be given it, I do not think I would be making this criticism of the section, but I am afraid it goes further than that.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is limited by the words "in so far as may be necessary to secure an adequate supply for the Army and Navy."

Mr. KING. I am afraid that some agent of the Government, anxious to assert his authority, may invade the manufacturing plants and give orders as to the manner in which timbers shall be cut, even though there be no contractual relation between him and the Government and neither his plant nor his logs may have been requisitioned by the Government.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, if that sort of thing were done, the sawmill man would not be forced to submit to it at all, unless, as a matter of fact, the orders were given as a part of the military program to supply the military or naval necessities of the Government. If I did not think the bill meant that, I would never vote for it, and if it means no more than that, no Senator, of course, can afford to oppose it, because it is necessary to give the Government this power in order to prosecute the war.

Mr. KING. Of course, the Government must have the power to requisition whatever property, real or personal, may be necessary to aid in the prosecution of the war. It should have the power to condemn and take possession of mills as well as standing timber. But my objection is that there may be an abuse or perversion of the authority conferred by this measure and officious employees attempt to interfere with the operations of private persons.

I suggest, Mr. President, to the committee that if the bill shall go to conference, or when it shall go to the other House, that the language of this section be changed, so as to relieve it from the criticism which I am now urging against the measure.

Just one further observation, Mr. President, in view of the discussion which has occurred concerning the Industrial Workers of the World and their activities. My only reason for recurring to the subject at this time is that I have recently received a number of communications from individuals and corporations in the West who are engaged in industrial pursuits and in supplying power for manufacturing, municipal, and other purposes, urging that the National Government shall not withdraw the troops that are now stationed in many of the Western States doing police duty and furnishing protection to the plants and properties there being operated. It is urged as one of the reasons why the Government should furnish troops and afford protection to mines, smelters, railroads, and manufacturing plants that the Industrial Workers of the World are so active and are such a menace that property will be destroyed and business paralyzed if the troops are withdrawn.

It is also claimed that the Government is directly interested in the output of some of the mines, smelters, and plants now being operated, and the operation of which is threatened. The criminal acts of this disloyal and outlawed organization are known to the people of the West. I used the word "outlawed" because the members of the organization claim to be outlaws—that is, without the pale of law and not subject to law.

Members of this organization know no country, owe allegiance to no flag, and are the avowed enemies of law and order and of the civilization of our land. They are the enemies of our country, and are giving aid and comfort to our foes. They resort to all forms of violence, and have no regard for human life. Their strikes are not to secure higher wages or improved

conditions for labor. They seek the destruction of our industrial system and the overthrow of our Government. If possible, they would close every factory, shut down every manufacturing plant, destroy every ship, and have our soldiers to starve in lands beyond the sea.

They do not seek work or desire to increase the prosperity of our land or of other lands. Their creed is diabolical and abhorrent to all men who love liberty and law.

They are now aiding Germany and endeavoring to create a reign of terror in the sections where they operate.

They must be dealt with in a firm and unyielding manner. There has been too much maudlin sympathy lavished upon them by silly cranks and foolish "uplifters."

There are some well-meaning persons who are dangerous to society when they attempt to deal with labor and labor questions. They become apologists for crimes and wicked industrial upheavals if they think labor is in any manner involved.

Sabotage, destruction of property by violence, strikes in which no grievance upon the part of honest labor is involved—all these things are defended and justified by some foolish, hare-brained "reformers" who worm their way into public position and who seek the limelight of publicity.

The attitude of persons of this character encourages the Industrial Workers of the World and agitators who seek the dislocation of our industrial system. In my opinion there has been too much sympathy manifested by some of the representatives of branches of the Government toward lawbreakers and lawless elements of the Industrial Workers of the World organization.

Recently a large number of Industrial Workers of the World gathered in one of the mining towns of Arizona. They called strikes, defied the law, committed many crimes, took possession of property, prevented honest men from working, and created a condition of anarchy and terror. Finally the residents of the town organized and drove the Industrial Workers of the World from their midst. It was a drastic step. It was perhaps without legal sanction. But the frightful condition brought about by the reign of the organization which knows no law became intolerable to those who had homes and property and who desired peace and opportunity to labor.

An investigation was conducted by some persons representing certain branches of the Government. I have not seen the report, but have seen references to it. If it is of the character represented, it is in my opinion too much of an apology for this criminal organization and expresses too great sympathy for its members.

The Government of the United States and the State authorities must deal with those who are spreading disloyalty, who are inciting domestic violence, and who are endeavoring to help Prussian militarism to win in this titanic conflict in a stern and relentless way. Acts which amount to treason must bring the penalty of treason. We are in war with a mighty foe, and the cowards and traitors within our own bosom must be dealt with as persons of that character should be treated in time of war.

Some of the leaders of the Industrial Workers of the World organization are now being tried in Chicago for alleged violations of criminal statutes of the United States.

The authorities, both State and National, should courageously and effectively deal with this evil. We can not constantly be menaced by an enemy so treacherous and deadly.

Recurring to the requests made that the Government continue to maintain troops in the States in order to protect property, I desire to add that I have written to a number of persons stating that the States should furnish proper police protection; that if authority had not been given to the governors of the respective States, the legislatures should be convened and adequate provision made by law for the proper police protection of the people and their property.

It may prove a heavy burden for some States, but they should not hesitate to discharge the functions required of sovereign States. I do not think that the Government ought to be called upon now, when it needs every soldier that is available, to furnish police protection in the States. Of course there may arise situations which demand Federal intervention for the protection of life and property.

In many of the Eastern States, such as New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, ample provisions are made by the States themselves to protect private enterprises and the manufacturing plants as well as to furnish adequate police protection to the people. I do not think that the States ought to shirk the responsibility resting upon them and attempt to devolve upon the Federal Government the duty and responsibility of policing the States.

Of course, in view of the activities of the Industrial Workers of the World, it is obvious that something must be done. They are a menace to the peace and security of the people; they constitute a constant conspiracy; they are committing crimes daily and hourly; the organization itself is a conspiracy, and every member of the organization, by reason of membership in the organization and in view of the proclamations and the avowed purposes of the organization, is committing a crime. The States should enforce their criminal statutes, and the Federal Government should apply the criminal statutes which reach the activities of this organization.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, I am on the Military Affairs Committee, and was present when this bill was first considered. I do not feel that I want to oppose any measure which will interfere with the aircraft program or the shipbuilding program. I am not convinced, however, that the shortage in spruce is due entirely to a lack of authority by the War Department, nor did I see or hear any evidence before the committee that the Shipping Board was not getting all the lumber it desired.

I think the shortage in spruce is due more to the bad management of the Aircraft Production Board than to a lack of authority. I think if they had had proper efficiency they could have gotten all the spruce they wanted. That is the impression that I gained from the evidence. This bill is very broad in its provisions. It has been the policy of this Government for the past 15 or 20 years to conserve the forests of the country. The bill permits the Government to go into any private forest and cut timber therein, to go into the Government lands and cut timber—for war purposes, it is true—but we should be absolutely sure, we should be convinced, that it is necessary before we empower these various agencies of Government to go into these forests and cut ad libitum, without any restrictions of forestation, without any regulations, this standing timber, because if they destroy it carelessly or wantonly the forests never can be restored. I think the Senate ought to have more evidence of the necessity of this act before it gives these broad powers to the War Department.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I am surprised that there has been so much discussion about this question here this morning. It seems to me to be a very simple one. Much of the discussion has been interesting, but it seems to me altogether beside the question.

What the Government desired was authority to use certain timbers in a certain way, to make selections of the timbers where it was found necessary to do so, to have them manufactured if the necessity required that it should be done, and to have them manufactured at a different plant than the one where the logs might have been in the first instance expected to be manufactured if the necessity requires it. The testimony before the Military Affairs Committee showed conclusively to me that there was a necessity for the exercise of this power, and the committee well-nigh unanimously reported this bill.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will the Senator kindly show me in the evidence where there was any testimony as to the necessity for additional authority? I think the evidence all showed that there was a lack of efficiency.

Mr. KIRBY. I am not saying that the evidence did not show that there was a lack of efficiency; but the evidence showed that these airplanes have not been built, that the ships have not been built, and that we could not get the lumber. Then the people who are in charge of these things said, "We can get the lumber if we have this additional power," and all the people who manufactured lumber and all the people who own the timber said that there was no complaint about the price that the Government was offering for the timber standing or the lumber manufactured. Sometimes there is a tract of timber the owner of which is not on the ground. Sometimes the trees are found on tracts of land where you can not get in communication with the owner, perhaps. You can use that timber under this sort of a bill. You can use any timber that is desired or necessary, and nobody who owns the timber is complaining about it, and the Government says it must have it. Then why should they not have this kind of authority?

It is safeguarded everywhere. The individual owner can not lose anything. The people who are in the manufacturing part of the business have said the prices that the Government is paying are reasonable. I think the prices are exorbitant; but there was no complaint made on the part of the Government. It said, "We need these logs and timbers, we need them now, and we

can get them without any further trouble, obstruction, or delay only in this way."

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KIRBY. I do.

Mr. KING. I want to ask the Senator by what means the railroads will be constructed and machinery will be acquired for the purpose of procuring the timber? This bill, as I read it, carries no appropriation for that object.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, it is not contemplated that the Government will have to go into the manufacture at all. It might find it necessary to take certain trees from certain people, to haul them to the plants that are already installed out there, or to direct that that be done, and it would be done in that way. The Government does not expect to go into the manufacturing of lumber at all, but to use the plants that are already constructed and are already engaged in that sort of industry. It seemed to me that the testimony indicated that while certain mills stated that they were perfectly willing to do everything that the Government desired to have done, yet it was not done. When they know that the Government expects to do these things itself, or to require them to be done, that it has the power to do it, there will be no further objection.

I think probably it will not be necessary to use this power at all if it is granted; and, as I understand, everybody, or almost everybody, engaged in this industry conceded that the provisions of this bill were fair; that everybody will be taken care of properly under it. The committee, some members of which are accustomed to construing laws, thought that this bill would be fair to every interest, and that every private and individual interest was properly safeguarded by its terms.

Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. KING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. This spruce is to be used, if needed, in the construction of airplanes, I believe.

Mr. KIRBY. Aircraft and shipbuilding.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes. Now, as I recall, we appropriated \$640,000,000 to construct fighting aircraft.

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. Can the Senator tell me how many have been constructed?

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I am not very well advised as to that, but very few have been constructed and completed here yet.

Mr. GALLINGER. They have had spruce enough to build a great many, have they not?

Mr. KIRBY. Oh, the spruce is out there, I will say to the Senator, and a great deal of spruce has been manufactured, and probably they could have gotten more spruce than has been used; but they regard this necessary, under the conditions as they exist in order to facilitate the work both of ship construction and of airplane construction.

Mr. GALLINGER. Do they use much spruce in ship construction?

Mr. KIRBY. I understand that they have to get all their big timbers from the West. The southern pine is not large enough to cut the timbers required in the construction of ships, and they must get the big timbers from out there.

Mr. GALLINGER. What puzzles me is this—and I am entirely frank about it, and do not ask any question or make any suggestion to embarrass the consideration of the bill: If they have had spruce enough to construct a good many airships, why have they not constructed more than they have now? Why are they anxious about getting spruce that can not be used for a long time at best, because it will take a long time to use up what they have on hand, as I understand the situation?

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I do not so understand it; and if we do not get out this lumber until the day we need it we never will have any airships constructed. I do not know what the fact is about the amount of lumber already purchased that is available for airship construction; but I do understand that they are going forward with it now at good speed, and in such a way as will produce in great quantities the airships that we regard as absolutely necessary in the fighting yonder in France.

Mr. GALLINGER. As they have used \$640,000,000—and I understand that that has been exhausted, and that they have a deficit of \$100,000,000 or \$200,000,000 at the present time—it seems to me they ought to have used up more spruce than they have up to this moment. I do not know what they are doing, but we are not getting any airships; that is certain.

Mr. KIRBY. I was only speaking of what is regarded as the necessity for the introduction of this bill asking for this addi-

tional power. I do not think there is any necessity for putting in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia. He refers to an existing agency. It seems to be apparent from the language of the bill that an existing agency is referred to, but no agency except one designated by the President can exercise this power.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], the chairman of the committee, contended that the language might mean just exactly that.

Mr. KIRBY. That it might mean that?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; that it might mean that the President could create an entirely new agency.

Mr. KIRBY. Well, it is possible that that construction might be adopted; but what is the difference? If the necessity exists, and only an agency designated by the President for the purpose can put into operation the provisions of the bill, and he can only operate in accordance with the provisions of the bill, that will protect everybody amply; so what difference does it make whether the agency is now in existence or whether it shall be created hereafter?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. KIRBY. Certainly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will tell the Senator what difference it makes. We have a thousand useless commissions already and I do not want to create another one. I should like to abolish a few of those we already have.

Mr. KIRBY. I might agree with the Senator on some of that.

Mr. HARDWICK. Then, what is the need of creating a new one?

Mr. KIRBY. But here is the proposition: This bill is introduced to meet an emergency, and the people who are engaged in this operation and construction now are evidently the people who will be designated to take care of it and to go on with the operation and the construction. Certainly they would not go and hunt up somebody else to do it, under the conditions existing.

As to the objection raised by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], about its interfering with pulp production, I do not think there is a possibility of that being done under this bill, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] has already said. If they have logs on hand in a pulp mill that might be used and that could be commandeered under this bill for use by the Government, they certainly would not go and take them from a mill where it could not be manufactured into lumber unless it was reasonably in the vicinity of another place where it could be manufactured, and under the provisions of the bill they would be bound anyway to leave all the logs at that mill that could be reasonably required for its continued operation, whether it was a pulp mill or a lumber mill, under any fair construction of this bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. KIRBY. I do.

Mr. KING. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] a moment ago stated, as I understood his observation, that there was inefficiency in the Aircraft Board, which brought about the necessity of some legislation, if any legislation of this character was required. I want to ask the Senator if, in his investigations—and I do not want him to disclose anything that would not be proper—there was inefficiency exhibited in the Aircraft Board, and if that inefficiency was found upon the part of civilian members, such as Mr. Coffin, or was found upon the part of the officers?

I want to say to the Senator that my experience in connection with some of these civilians who are offering their services to the Government has somewhat shaken my confidence in the business ability of civilians and increased my confidence in the business ability of officers of the Army.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I do not want to be in the attitude of rendering judgment about whether a particular man is efficient or inefficient, when I do not know the conditions surrounding the man, or the operations in which he has been engaged. I do not know whether a civilian or an officer might have better business ability. Whether a man has sense or not does not depend on whether he is a civilian or an officer in the Army. It never has been properly determined in that way, and it can not be determined in that way now.

It may be that some of these officers in the Army have more sense than the civilian business men. It may be that they are better qualified to do some of these things; but because a man wears the uniform of the Government of the United States it does not follow that he is a better business man than somebody else on the outside who has devoted his whole time to business and the pursuit of it.

I do not know whether there has been much inefficiency or not. I do not believe there is, in a broad and liberal way of discussing it. But if there has been inefficiency, if it has delayed the construction of the aircraft, we need the aircraft now, and this will conduce to their speedy construction. This remedies the condition and completes it so far as the Government is concerned.

I hope this bill will be passed without any further discussion. I have been surprised that there was so much. I tried for half an hour to stay out of it, but was unable to do so because of the apparent misunderstanding by some Senators of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I desire to suggest an amendment after the word "operations," at the end of line 19, page 4.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, would it not be better if the Senator would wait until we get to that part of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, I beg pardon.

Mr. FLETCHER. We have been talking about the amendment of the Senator from Georgia so far.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I do not think the reasons advanced for supporting the bill have been sufficient. They are not the real ones. I do not think any mill owner in the United States has refused to operate his mill in accordance with the demands of the Government as fully as it was possible for him to do it. I have had some correspondence in reference to this measure, and I have heard from no source that there was any disposition on the part of any bona fide lumberman or mill owner to do otherwise than act in harmony with the wishes of the Government.

That there has been inefficiency in the conduct of the Government's end of the lumber business required for airplane production there is not the slightest doubt. The evidence has been disclosed before the Military Affairs Committee, and it is overwhelming. It is known to every man who has investigated the subject. I think it is a fact, however, that in the region of the United States where spruce is grown a great deal of timber is owned either by aliens, by estates in court, or by people whose residences are not known. It is that particular timber that the Government is seeking to obtain—that is, if it is acting in good faith with this measure.

In my judgment it is a mistake to impute anything but a willingness to cooperate with the Government to the persons owning and operating the mills; but this timber which is sought to be obtained, the ownership of which is not known, could be reached by some other measure than one of this kind. I do not care to oppose the bill, however, although I dislike very much to have the excuse offered that there is some difficulty with the mills as the cause of our lack of production of airplanes. The lumbermen are not causing the delay in aircraft production, if there is delay. Sufficient spruce is and has been available for the construction of many planes. We have distressingly few.

I do not wish to criticize the Aircraft Production Board. This probably is not the time or the place to do it, and I am not prepared to do it, but I do know that the reasons given here this morning are not the real cause of the failure to produce aircraft. It is this camouflage, this misrepresentation of facts, to which I object. If, instead of creating artificial scapegoats, more airships were created from the material at hand I would be better satisfied. We all want to build airplanes. We all want to pass any kind of a law necessary to speed up production, but that speeding up can not be obtained by charging the timber and mill owners, who are operating as the Government wants them to operate, with obstructing Government operations. This bill, like many others of recent birth, is unnecessary for effective war preparation. I wish the administration would use effectively the power which it already has before it asks for more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 9054, the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think it is probable that this bill could be disposed of in a short time.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think so.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would be glad to have that done, especially as that is the view of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SMOOT. I hope the Senator will not ask it, because I shall be compelled to object to his request. There are Senators who have told me they desire to speak on the bill to-morrow morning, and if the Senator from Oregon will bring it up at that time I have no doubt it will be passed.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. If the request is going to meet with objection, of course I will yield. I give notice that I shall

undertake to bring the bill up again for consideration at the close of the morning business to-morrow.

Mr. WARREN. Let me ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs if he does not think there ought to be a time given to take up the calendar and consider the 15 or 18 military bills on it relating to war measures and consider them all?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think so. I think some of them are very, very important.

Mr. WARREN. Indeed they are important.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. And the department requests us to have them disposed of. I shall ask in due course in the next day or two that those bills shall be taken up and disposed of.

Mr. WARREN. I hope the Senator will do so, because on the subject of the draft and other matters there ought to be legislation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire at this time to submit an amendment to Senate bill 3426, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] to suspend the rules.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] desires to address himself to this motion. I do not just know where the Senator is. He is temporarily out of the Chamber.

Mr. HARDWICK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll. The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Henderson	Nugent	Thomas
Beckham	Hitchcock	Overman	Thompson
Borah	Johnson, Cal.	Pittman	Tillman
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poindexter	Townsend
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Trammell
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Robinson	Underwood
Cummins	Kling	Shafroth	Vardaman
Curtis	Kirby	Sheppard	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Knox	Sherman	Walsh
Fletcher	McCumber	Simmons	Warren
France	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Watson
Frelinghuysen	McLean	Smith, Ga.	Weeks
Gallinger	McNary	Smoot	Williams
Gronna	Martin	Sterling	Wolcott
Hale	Myers	Stone	
Harding	New	Sutherland	
Hardwick	Norris	Swanson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] to suspend the rules.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I know there is a Senator who desires to discuss this matter further. I do not desire to do it myself, but the Senator has been sent for. As I have not anything to say myself I can only call attention to the fact that there is a Senator who desires to discuss the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BORAH. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, this bill has been discussed at some length before on both sides of the proposition, but it seems to me it is a question which involves the gravest consequences and it ought to be considered with due deliberation.

We ought to do, Mr. President, whatever is best calculated to stimulate the production of wheat in the situation in which we find ourselves now. If it be true that we can stimulate the production of wheat best by not increasing the minimum price guaranteed by law, then we ought not to increase that minimum price.

The view has been urged in some quarters that the effect of increasing the minimum price would be simply and solely to cause the farmer to hold the wheat he has already made and to hoard it or to cause it to be hoarded by some one, and for that reason it is unsafe and unwise to adopt the plan suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Personally I have been inclined to the other view. With no such governmental control exercised over the price of other grains—barley, corn, and rye—and with a rapid rising price of those grains the farmer has been tempted to plant them. He would rather raise these grains at \$3 than wheat at \$2.20, or even at \$2.50. So it has appeared to me that the wise thing

to do is to follow the plan suggested by the Senator from Oklahoma and increase the minimum we are willing to guarantee the farmer. For that reason I have been prepared, although I live in a wheat-consuming rather than a wheat-producing State, to vote for a larger guaranty to the farmer with respect to this particular matter.

It seems to me, however, that the principal value of the lesson that we are learning from this whole thing is how utterly useless it is to attempt to regulate such matters by statute law at all. I think we would really be a great deal better off if we had never undertaken it in the first instance. Still we are confronted by a situation and not by a theory, and it is necessary to do whatever we think is best for the country as a whole and for the world as a whole when it comes to the disposition of this matter.

Believing, as I do, that it is absolutely for the best interests of the world, with great fields in other continents laid in ruins almost by the war, to stimulate production in this country, operating under the system that we are now operating under, I am willing to take rather extreme measures in order to stimulate that production and to increase the world's bread supply.

I do not think the Senate in voting on this question ought to look at it from a local standpoint, certainly not from the standpoint of a State, certainly not from the standpoint even of this country, but we ought to consider the world condition and the world situation; and when we consider the world condition and the world situation I believe we will be forced to the conclusion that any possible way of stimulating and increasing production is an absolute necessity at this juncture if the people of the world are to be fed and if this war is to be fought at all and if it is to be maintained at all.

Personally I feel very great reluctance to support a proposition to increase the price of bread to the consumer, but we had better furnish the consumer with bread even at a little higher price than to have the consumer unable to buy bread at any price, as he was recently unable to buy coal at any price on account of a proposition just about like this, throwing another monkey wrench into the machinery.

So, while I would rather not increase the price or raise the guaranty, yet if Senators believe, as I believe, that production will not be great enough and can not be stimulated enough without that being done, I can see no other plan or method except to support the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

I assume that before the vote is taken not only the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], but the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], will address the Senate at length in support of that proposition and in advocacy of the motion presented by the Senator from Oklahoma. I shall expect those Senators who have served on the committee and who have had the opportunity of hearing the testimony that was given and of weighing the contentions that were made and of knowing the facts accurately as relating to this situation to give to the Senate and to the country valuable information upon which to base an opinion with respect to this matter, and that they will be able to give to the Senate itself and to the Members of the Senate valuable information upon which we can base our votes with respect to the matter.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names.

Ashurst	Hitchcock	Overman	Stone
Baird	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Thomas
Bankhead	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Thompson
Beckham	Jones, Wash.	Poindexter	Tillman
Borah	Kellogg	Pomerene	Trammell
Chamberlain	Kirby	Ransdell	Underwood
Culberson	Lodge	Reed	Vardaman
Cummins	McCumber	Robinson	Wadsworth
Dillingham	McKellar	Shafroth	Walsh
Fall	McLean	Sheppard	Watson
France	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	Weeks
Gore	Nelson	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Gronna	New	Smith, Mich.	Wolcott
Hale	Norris	Smoot	
Harding	Nugent	Sterling	

Mr. RANSDELL. I wish to announce the absence on official business of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum of the Senate present.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, whenever a motion has been made to suspend the rules of the Senate, as long as I have been in the Senate I have voted against it. I have given my reasons for that course in the past, and I am not going to take the time of the Senate to repeat them, but simply to say that I never

expect to vote to suspend the rules of the Senate unless there is a national crisis involved.

In this case I do not believe that to be the case, and therefore I shall vote against suspending the rule. I do not know that it is necessary for me to go into the question of the price of wheat at this time. It has been discussed thoroughly. I know the critical condition existing in our country, and I know that something must be done to get the farmers to raise wheat, in order not only to feed the American people but to feed our allies, and it seems to me to accomplish this it ought to be done by direct legislation. If it comes up in that way I am going to support the increase, but, Mr. President, I do not feel justified in voting for a suspension of the rule.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to discuss upon its merits the question, Should the law be so amended that the price of the farmer's wheat can not be forced by the Food Administration to a point below \$2.50 per bushel? I shall only speak on one point and very briefly. I do not think that we sufficiently appreciate the fact that the basis of money values has in recent months tactically changed. This is the great force back of advancing prices that few of us have fully comprehended. I think the sooner we do appreciate the truth that money has depreciated in value to an enormous extent and that business must be done upon a different money-value basis the better it will be for the country.

Mr. President, the production of gold for many years prior to 1873 was only about one-fifth what the production has been for the last 10 or 12 years. That is one of the causes for the increase in the volume of money. Since the war began the money of the world has been inflated by paper issues, so that in some of the countries of the world it is nearly nine times what it was prior to the beginning of the war. In our own country there has been an enormous inflation of gold growing out of the fact that there has been a favorable balance of trade since the European war began.

In addition to that there has been an increased coinage of silver, and in addition to that there has been a very large increase in bank currency arising from the issues of the Federal reserve banks.

Beyond all this there has been a vast multiplication of bank deposits. Everyone who has given the question study knows that an increase of bank deposits means a multiplication of what I intend to call, for the sake of a descriptive term, check currency.

There has also been an increased activity in the movement of bank deposits and the movement of money, and now on top of all that comes an enormous issue of bonds; and the issuance of bonds, as everyone who has studied the question knows, is in itself, if not actual inflation, in the nature of inflation.

So I do not think that I am at all outside the fact when I say that in my opinion the purchasing value of a dollar has depreciated in the last three years 50 per cent, and, I am inclined to think, even more than 50 per cent.

I have refrained from putting into the few remarks I have made long lists of figures that I might give. At some other time I may claim the attention of the Senate in order to state the figures in detail. If I am even approximately correct in the conclusion I have just announced, then we may as well get ready to acknowledge the fact that money has gone down. It follows that a price expressed in dollars may seem large when, in fact, the purchasing value of a dollar has so decreased that the price is not as great as it was a few years ago.

I offer that observation, and it will be found that it is true wherever we apply it to concrete facts. When we undertook to fix the price of wheat a year ago—that is, a minimum price—there were many Senators on the floor who were appalled at the proposition of \$2 wheat; but \$2 wheat it was at once discovered was too low, even the Garfield Commission found that it was too low. The price mentioned was for the high grades of wheat, and at their terminal markets the farmer did not realize anything like \$2.20. It may be seriously questioned whether the price paid the farmer would buy as much as the price he received some years ago.

I call the Senate's attention to the fact that in the first address which he delivered to the present session of Congress the President expressly stated that the farmer had been unjustly treated. He could have had reference to nothing except wheat, because up to that time wheat was the only thing the farmer raised that had been regulated, and yet the President told us that the farmer had just cause for complaint. I do not undertake to quote his exact language, but that is, in substance, the language. I, however, want to put my appeal to the Senate in this matter upon a higher ground than even the interest of the farmers. I put it upon the ground that Mr. Hoover and every man who is concerned or interested in the

wheat question has certified to us over and over again that wheat is absolutely necessary in order to win the war.

We have been told not once but hundreds of times by those occupying positions of high authority that our allies can not be fed upon corn; that they can not be fed upon rye; that they can not be fed upon barley; but that they must have wheat. Hence the American people are asked to eat great quantities of the coarser cereals in order that we may send large amounts of wheat to Europe.

Moreover, we have recently been told that there is an actual shortage of wheat for the supply of the allies and the supply of ourselves. Mr. President, we are at the spring wheat-planting time. At the prices as they existed a few days ago a farmer can make out of planting his 100 acres of land to corn approximately 50 per cent more than he can possibly make by planting it to wheat, understanding that the crops shall run on the average as they have for 50 years. He can make more money in planting his 100 acres to oats, and next year very much more money putting the land to clover or alfalfa or to timothy hay, than he can to planting wheat.

Under these circumstances, what is the wise thing for the Congress to do? We want more wheat. If we want more wheat, we ought not to allow a condition to exist which penalize the farmer upon every acre he sows to wheat, which makes it the most unprofitable crop he can possibly plant, which advises him in advance that when he plants wheat he is planting the crop which will bring him the least possible return. I appeal to Senators, therefore, whether this very modest and slight increase in the price of wheat is not in the interest of the whole country; is not in the interest of the consumer as well as the interest of the producer?

I need not say that I have strenuously advocated a policy of no price fixing, except to reach profiteering or gambling; but that advocacy has been overruled and we have entered upon the policy of price fixing. It is absolutely necessary, if we are to have a wheat crop that will come to the volume necessary to supply ourselves and the world, that the farmers shall be induced to plant as much wheat as can possibly be grown. If that is done, we shall have cheaper flour in the fall and we shall be out of danger of a serious bread shortage. But if we are short of wheat, prices will go up, for there never was a shortage of grain yet that did not produce very high prices to the consumer.

I hope that the proposition to suspend the rules will be adopted, so that we may be permitted to pass the amendment. Let us encourage the farmers by granting them this slight increase in the price of wheat.

That is all I desire to say, and I thank the Senate for its courteous attention.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] had read into the RECORD a quotation from Mr. Cotton, who is at the head of the meat division of the Food Administration, in which Mr. Cotton declared that the price of corn was fictitious and that he hoped the price would be reduced. It is fair to assume that, in giving expression to that view, he reflected the view of the Food Administration. The price of corn has been reduced within the last few days; I believe there has been a decline of something like 30 cents a bushel in its price. As shedding some light upon that decline I ask to have read into the RECORD a telegram from the Dazey-Moore Grain Co., of Fort Worth, Tex. If the statements contained in this telegram be true, the suspicion of duplicity can hardly be avoided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NUGENT in the chair). Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

FORT WORTH, TEX., March 18, 1918.

HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Washington, D. C.:

Ten days ago there was an urgent demand for corn; producers and dealers were told by the Food Administration that it was far behind its program of supplying Europe, and they were urged to strain every nerve to ship as much corn as possible during the next 30 days. The railroad administration was criticized for failure to supply cars, and in every way the impression was created that every bushel of corn that could be shipped before spring farm work commenced would be urgently needed. Producers and shippers of grain have responded to the appeals that were made to them. They have held back their oats and other grains and have given preference to shipping corn, never suspecting for a moment that there would be any interference with the demand for a commodity in such abundant supply as corn, of which the largest crop ever produced was raised during the crop year of 1917. It is therefore difficult to imagine the feeling of producers and shippers when all of a sudden and without warning the export demand for corn came to a sudden stop, and they are forced to sacrifice grain for which they expected to find an urgent demand. Foreign buying having been placed entirely in the hands of one buyer, the Wheat Export Co., an organization supposed to be composed of the Governments of Great Britain, France, and Italy, this organization was not naturally suspected of market manipulating. We to-day, however, are in receipt of a telegram from the Wheat Export Co. stating it to be a matter of regret

that they can not buy more corn, assigning as a reason that they are under strict instructions from the Food Administration not to do so. There are several questions presented by this situation, but the outstanding one and the question that deserves immediate and serious consideration is the good faith of the Food Administration in appealing for the largest possible movement of corn and then withdrawing the main support of the market when the heavy movement is at its height. Another question relates to the wisdom of intrusting to one man as much power as is used by the Food Administration and still another—and one of very great magnitude—is whether he has not acted in bad faith with Congress by exercising far greater powers than were conferred upon him. So far as we are personally concerned the time has come when we can not conduct our business with any degree of certainty. We never know what a day will bring forth. The immutable law of supply and demand has been suspended, competition between foreign buyers has been destroyed. Concentration and monopoly have superseded the open competitive market and producers and distributors are now at the mercy of one man, and that man is the man selected by a foreign Government to evolve a system for holding in check the prices of the surplus food produced in the United States. Please furnish copies to Senator GORE and Senator REED.

DAZEY-MOORE GRAIN CO.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the only point I care to make on this telegram is this: Mr. Cotton was before the Committee on Agriculture this morning. He reiterated the declaration that the price of corn was fictitious; he reiterated the hope that the price of corn would decline. Now, whether it be a concerted plan or not, evidently the Food Administration share Mr. Cotton's views, and this telegram indicates that they have been able to find ways and means to realize the hope expressed by Mr. Cotton.

The motives for that I am, of course, unable to divine. It may be that they desire to break the price of corn on the eve of the spring wheat sowing, with the hope that the relative profits will be shifted and the farmers who had intended to plant corn on the basis of the prevailing high prices will now shift to wheat, with the hope that possibly they might squeeze as much out of wheat as out of corn. Further than that I have no observation to make.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in connection with the telegram the Senator from Oklahoma has just presented, I desire to say that when I heard that the price of corn was suddenly breaking I wired one of the best-informed grain men in the West asking the cause. I received a reply in which he stated that at this time he could not tell the cause further than that all the orders for corn which had been placed in that market from the East had suddenly been canceled and that it looked like a concert of action for the purpose of breaking the market. That is not his exact language, but that is the inference.

I am very sorry if the thing which seems to be indicated is true, and I say to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that it is undoubtedly the duty of that committee at once to go to the bottom of this matter.

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that I asked Mr. Cotton this morning to furnish me the names of those who would be in a situation to tell the truth and the whole truth about this transaction.

Mr. REED. Let me ask, Who is Mr. Cotton?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Cotton is at the head of the meat division of the Food Administration.

Mr. REED. What was his business before he took that place, if the Senator knows?

Mr. GORE. By profession he is an attorney.

Mr. REED. Who was he attorney for, especially?

Mr. GORE. He was a member of the firm of Spooner & Cotton, Mr. Spooner formerly being a distinguished Member of this body, and he had a considerable clientele, as I understand, in New York City. He was examined upon that point this morning at some length, and I may say that he said that he had no experience in the production of live stock, which was the particular matter under consideration; and in connection with that the corn situation was brought out.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, it will be observed that the signer of that telegram requested me to send copies of it to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This I did in compliance with the request of my constituent. The Senator from Oklahoma had the telegram published in the RECORD on his own responsibility. So far as I am concerned, I am not in sympathy with any charge of bad faith against Mr. Hoover or the Food Administration.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Texas has any knowledge as to the facts stated in this telegram?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not have.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator know the gentleman who signed the telegram?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I know a member of the firm. I do not know all the members of the firm.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator regard them as a responsible firm?

Mr. SHEPPARD. So far as I know, they are a responsible firm.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have said all that I care to say on this subject, except that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has for the last five weeks held hearings for the purpose of ascertaining if there is any untruth in the statement that production is being interfered with on account both of the price fixed and the regulations promulgated by the Food Administration. As one of the members of that committee, I feel that I have done my duty. I have called to the attention of the Senate as best I could the facts as they have been presented to the committee. They were not conclusions of my own, but were the facts presented by witnesses from various parts of the United States.

It is true, Mr. President, that there is great danger of production being decreased, due in part to the price, but more so to the drastic orders being issued and by regulations which, while not directly fixing prices, by indirection do so, and constitute the real cause of the reduced price. That applies, of course, to cattle and to hogs. I do not say that it applies so much to grain. We know, however, that wheat brings a higher price in the Argentine Republic to-day than it does in the United States.

I do not think that the statement of Mr. Cotton should stand unchallenged when he states that the price of corn to-day is a fictitious price. Of course, we have placed a minimum, which has become the maximum price of wheat. It has operated absolutely as a maximum, and it can not be anything but a maximum, when it is admitted both by Mr. Cotton and by Mr. Durand, who have both testified before our committee, that the Government of the United States and the allies have pooled their interests and have but one purchasing agency. I think any Senator will see that, if this system is continued and if the Food Administration shall proceed in that way, they will cripple the industries and decrease not only the production of wheat but they will discourage the production of other cereals absolutely necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. They will succeed also in decreasing the meat supply; and, of course, nothing of that kind should be done.

Mr. President, there are a great many facts which were presented to the Committee on Agriculture which we can not take the time of the Senate to explain now, but I believe that in the main those who have spoken upon this subject have fairly presented the conditions as they exist.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with relation to the motion to suspend the rules proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma for the purpose of adopting an amendment to fix the minimum price of wheat at \$2.50 per bushel.

The papers of last Monday tell us that the London Telegraph of the 15th instant contained a leading editorial which states that there is more necessity for our food than there is for our soldiers in Europe. It was said to be an elaborate editorial, going into details and showing the deplorable condition of shipping and the great necessity for our wheat.

It seems to me that the fact that the farmer has been feeding wheat to his stock, when it is not the usual food for them, and selling his corn, barley, and rye, is the best evidence that it is lower in price and less profitable to raise than the other cereal grains which he ordinarily produces. Human nature being the same the world over, the farmer is going to plant that crop which will yield him the most money, and will not plant that which brings him less money. Wheat averages 14.7 bushels per acre; price now, \$2.20; yields per acre \$32.34. Corn averages 26.1 bushels per acre; price now, \$1.85; yields per acre \$48.29. Rye averages 16.1 bushels per acre; price now, \$2.99; yields per acre \$48.14. Barley averages 24.2 bushels per acre; price now \$2.25; yields per acre \$54.45. Oats averages 31.2 bushels per acre; price now, 98 cents; yields per acre \$30.58. The condition to which I have referred demonstrates conclusively to me that wheat is not commanding the price to which it would be entitled under the principle of supply and demand. He will therefore plant those cereals which will bring the best prices. The public will not be benefited because they will be compelled to buy the high-priced substitutes.

I believe that it is necessary to have wheat raised in large quantities in order to win this war. I think all concede that it is necessary in order to prevent starvation almost in many sections of Europe that the wheat crop should be as large as possible. That being the case, why is it that we will not remove the limit that has been placed upon the price of wheat? Why is it that we will not allow it to command that price which the application of the law of supply and demand would entitle it? In the consideration of the food-control bill last summer all conceded that only a minimum price was fixed, which would stimulate the production of wheat.

There is no danger of the farmers making a corner on wheat; the farmers never have tried to do that; every one of the corners that have been manipulated successfully in the United States has been accomplished by speculators. The object that was intended to be accomplished by the licensing of elevators and of mills was not to curb the price of wheat to the farmer, but it was for the purpose of preventing the speculation in which brokers and others indulge in endeavoring to increase abnormally the price of this staple product.

It is better for even the consumer to have wheat at a higher price than it is not to have wheat at all. Senators have said that some States have not planted up to this time within 25 per cent of the wheat they planted last year; and yet the demand is greater and is increasing, and the necessity for the wheat is growing greater all the time. It is said in my State that wheat will be absolutely out of the market after the 1st day of May. Now, is it possible that we are not going to encourage the production of that thing so absolutely necessary to the winning of the war?

A minimum price for wheat will encourage its production, but a maximum price for it will prove a failure.

Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the vote upon this measure; but it seems to me that this proposed amendment is nothing but fair and right to the farmer, and that we ought to suspend the rules and adopt the same.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Colorado have suggested one observation that I wish to make. I need not say to the Senate that I do not believe in any scheme of price fixing. In my judgment such an effort is foreordained to fail. Perhaps the oldest blunder known to the sons of men is the attempt at price fixing. The history of the effort is one dreary tale of uniform and unvarying failure, of disappointment, and oftentimes of disaster.

Whenever the attempt is made to regulate prices, the effort must inevitably work more or less mischief. I have offered the pending amendment in order to bring about a situation where we will work less rather than more mischief. I seek to minimize the mischief which must come; I seek to keep the mischief down to the irreducible minimum. That is the object of the proposed amendment.

We have been told on every hand that food is the key to the situation and that wheat is the pivotal food grain. Mr. Hoover assured us that there was a psychology about a wheaten loaf that was indispensable. There is no sufficient substitute for wheat; we have been appealed to to produce wheat in abundance on the assurance that wheat might win the war.

There is but one excuse or plea which renders the attempt at price fixing even rational. If there be some article like wheat which is of preeminent and of indispensable necessity, then fix a price upon that one article higher than the law of supply and demand would award. That will stimulate its production, and that will do all that human foresight can do to meet a crisis and to avert the possibility of disaster. Even that attempt will be attended with more or less mischief, because it throws other relations out of their proper proportion; but we ought like men to make up our minds to take those consequences whenever the necessity is overpowering.

Mr. President, what have we done? We have fixed a price on wheat. We have fixed a price on wheat, which may be needed to win this war, at a lower point than the law of supply and demand would award. Now, you can not encourage production by reducing prices. You can increase and stimulate production by increasing prices, but the reduction of prices must inevitably discourage production. Ought we to discourage the production of a grain which may be indispensable to our success in this war and to the guaranty of our destiny?

Mr. President, the fixing of a price on an article of indispensable necessity at a lower point than the law of supply and demand would award, with the hope of stimulating its production, is a transaction which, as a perfected specimen of human folly, has absolutely no competitor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). The question is, Shall the Senate suspend paragraph 3 of Rule XVI in order that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] may present in order the amendment proposed by him? On that question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). I desire to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent, due to illness in his family, but that if present he would vote for this motion and also for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]

to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is detained from the Chamber by reason of sickness, and I therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CALDER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and withhold my vote.

Mr. WEEKS. I find that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], with whom I have a general pair, is absent. I transfer my pair with him to the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and vote "yea."

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE]. I do not know how that Senator would vote on this question, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], who, I understand, would vote as I shall vote, if present. I vote "yea."

Mr. MCKELLAR. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIELDS] on public business.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX]. In his absence, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY].

The roll call resulted—yeas 48, nays 22, as follows:

YEAS—48.			
Baird	Henderson	New	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Hitchcock	Norris	Smith, Mich.
Cummins	Johnson, Cal.	Nugent	Sterling
Curtis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Stone
Fall	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Thompson
France	Kellogg	Page	Townsend
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Polindexter	Underwood
Gore	McKellar	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Gronna	McLean	Reed	Walsh
Hale	McNary	Shafroth	Watson
Harling	Myers	Sherman	Weeks
Hardwick	Nelson	Simmons	Wolcott
NAYS—22.			
Ashurst	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	Trammell
Beckham	Martin	Smoot	Vardaman
Fletcher	Pittman	Sutherland	Warren
Gallinger	Pomeroy	Swanson	Williams
Jones, N. Mex.	Robinson	Thomas	
Kirby	Sheppard	Tillman	
NOT VOTING—25.			
Bankhead	Dillingham	Kenyon	Saulsbury
Brandegee	Fernald	King	Shields
Broussard	Gerry	Knox	Smith, Md.
Calder	Goff	La Follette	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Hollis	Lewis	
Colt	James	Penrose	
Culberson	Kendrick	Phelan	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the motion to suspend the rules, the yeas are 48, the nays are 22. More than two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rule is suspended. The question now is upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE].

Mr. THOMAS. I call for the yeas and nays. Let us go on record.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment may be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of the bill, the following:

That section 14 of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. That whenever the President shall find that an emergency exists requiring stimulation of the production of wheat and that it is essential that the producers of wheat, produced within the United States, shall have the benefits from time to time, seasonably and as far in advance of seeding time as practicable, to determine and fix and to give public notice of what, under specified conditions, is a reasonable guaranteed price for wheat, in order to assure such producers a reasonable profit. The President shall thereupon fix such guaranteed price for each of the official grain standards for wheat as established under the United States grain standards act, approved August 11, 1916. The President shall from time to time establish and promulgate such regulations as he shall deem wise in connection with such guaranteed prices,

and in particular governing conditions of delivery and payment and differences in price for the several standard grades at the local elevator or the local railway market where such wheat is delivered from the farm where produced, adopting No. 1 northern spring or its equivalent as the basis. Thereupon the Government of the United States hereby guarantees every producer of wheat produced within the United States that, upon compliance by him with the regulations prescribed, he shall receive for any wheat produced in reliance upon this guaranty within the period, not exceeding 18 months, prescribed in the notice a price not less than the guaranteed price therefor as fixed pursuant to this section. In such regulations the President shall prescribe the terms and conditions upon which any such producer shall be entitled to the benefits of such guaranty. The guaranteed prices for the several standard grades of wheat for the crop of 1918 shall be based upon No. 2 northern spring, or its equivalent, at not less than \$2.50 per bushel at the local elevator or the local railway market where such wheat is delivered from the farm where produced.

"This guaranty shall not be dependent upon the action of the President under the first part of this section, but is hereby made absolute and shall be binding until May 1, 1919. When the President finds that the importation into the United States of any wheat produced outside of the United States materially enhances or is likely material to enhance the liabilities of the United States under guaranties of prices therefor made pursuant to this section, and ascertains what rate of duty, added to the then existing rate of duty on wheat and to the value of wheat at the time of importation would be sufficient to bring the price thereof at which imported up to the price fixed therefor pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section, he shall proclaim such facts, and thereafter there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon wheat when imported, in addition to the then existing rate of duty, the rate of duty so ascertained; but in no case shall any such rate of duty be fixed at an amount which will effect a reduction of the rate of duty upon wheat under any then existing tariff law of the United States. For the purpose of making any guaranteed price effective under this section, or whenever he deems it essential in order to protect the Government of the United States against material enhancement of its liabilities arising out of any guaranty under this section, the President is authorized also, in his discretion, to purchase any wheat for which a guaranteed price shall be fixed under this section, and to hold, transport, or store it, or to sell, dispose of, and deliver the same to any citizen of the United States or to any Government engaged in war with any country with which the Government of the United States is or may be at war, or to use the same as supplies for any department or agency of the Government of the United States. Any moneys received by the United States from or in connection with the sale or disposal of wheat under this section may, in the discretion of the President, be used as a revolving fund for further carrying out the purposes of this section. Any balance of such moneys not used as part of such revolving fund shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the amendment as read at the desk is long, is involved, and sounds very formidable, but I will say for the information of the Senate that it is a literal transcript of section 14 of the food-control act passed in August last, with only four changes.

One of the changes substitutes \$2.50 for \$2.

Another substitutes No. 2 northern for No. 1 northern.

Another change substitutes the local elevator or local railway market for the principal interior primary markets.

Another change is a proviso for settling the question which arose some weeks ago as to whether the guaranteed price of \$2 per bushel was an absolute and a maximum price or was only a minimum price, subject to increase by the President. It makes it clear that that price was prescribed by Congress as a minimum, and that it was subject to change by the President. I may add that it has since been changed by the President, being raised to \$2.20.

Those are the only changes proposed by this amendment to section 14 of the food-control act.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, can the Secretary read that portion of the amendment which provides for the last suggestion of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Senator from Oklahoma made four changes from the original text. I understand the first, second, and third changes to which he referred, but I did not gather the fourth change to which he referred.

Mr. GORE. I do not know that the changes appear in the amendment in the order that I mentioned. The last one I mentioned was this:

The act passed last summer carried a guaranty of \$2 a bushel for wheat. It was contended by some that that was not a minimum, and was not intended by Congress to be a minimum, but that, as a matter of fact, it was an absolute price—a maximum as well as a minimum price—and was not subject to change by the President. In order to make that point perfectly clear I inserted a proviso which removed the doubt upon the subject. I may say that that proviso is now unnecessary, because the President has, as a matter of fact, increased the price. I took occasion to get an interpretation of it the best way I could.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then it is that proviso that I wish to hear read. The Senator from Oklahoma was considering at one time a provision that looked toward a test in the courts.

Mr. GORE. That has been eliminated.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is nothing of that sort in this amendment?

Mr. GORE. No.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It does not affect the status of past sales in any way?

Mr. GORE. No.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It was to guard against that thought on the part of the Senator from Oklahoma, to which I was opposed, that I desired to hear it.

Mr. GORE. This has no relation whatever to that. It is a different amendment.

The SECRETARY. The amendment, on page 3, line 3, reads as follows:

The guaranteed prices for the several standard grades of wheat for the crop of 1918 shall be based upon No. 2 northern spring, or its equivalent, at not less than \$2.50 per bushel at the local elevator or the local railway market where such wheat is delivered from the farm where produced.

This guaranty shall not be dependent upon the action of the President under the first part of this section, but is hereby made absolute, and shall be binding until May 1, 1919.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, the Secretary has not read the portion I desired to hear read; but I understand now what it is, and I do not press further my inquiry to have any more read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], on which the yeas and nays have been requested and ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CALDER (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Because of my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is detained by sickness, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (when his name was called). Making the same announcement that I made a few minutes ago, I vote "yea."

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] on account of sickness in his family. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the previous roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote "nay."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as on the previous roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement made by me upon the previous roll call with regard to my pair and its transfer, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX], which I transfer to the senior Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], and vote "yea."

Mr. MCKELLAR. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SHIELDS] on public business.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Making the same announcement as before, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the negative). I notice that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], with whom I have a general pair, is out of the Chamber. I therefore withdraw my vote.

I desire also to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. GOFF] on account of illness. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY].

Mr. KIRBY. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—49.

Baird	Hitchcock	Nugent	Sterling
Borah	Johnson, Cal.	Overman	Thompson
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Owen	Townsend
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Page	Underwood
Curtis	Kellogg	Pol Dexter	Wadsworth
Fall	McCumber	Ransdell	Walsh
France	McLean	Reed	Warren
Frelinghuysen	McNary	Shafroth	Watson
Gore	Myers	Sherman	Weeks
Gronna	Nelson	Simmons	Wolcott
Hale	New	Smith, Ga.	
Harding	Norris	Smith, Mich.	
Hardwick		Smoot	

NAYS—18.

Ashurst	Mckellar	Sheppard	Trammell
Fletcher	Martin	Smith, Ariz.	Vardaman
Gallinger	Pittman	Swanson	Williams
Kirby	Pomerene	Thomas	
Lodge	Robinson	Tillman	

NOT VOTING—28.

Bankhead
Beckham
Brandegee
Broussard
Calder
Colt
Culberson

Dillingham
Fernald
Gerry
Goff
Henderson
Hollis
James

Kendrick
Kenyon
King
Knox
La Follette
Lewis
Penrose

Phelan
Saulsbury
Shields
Smith, Md.
Smith, S. C.
Stone
Sutherland

So Mr. GORE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I gave notice on the 18th of March that I would move to suspend the rule for the purpose of considering an amendment to what is termed the Borland amendment to the Agricultural appropriation bill. I should like to have that considered at this time. I ask that the notice be read by the Secretary.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, as I understand, the Borland amendment has already been approved in Committee of the Whole, and some Senator reserved the right to offer a motion to strike it out when the bill reaches the Senate. Would it not be the proper time to vote upon suspending the rule for this purpose when the bill gets into the Senate, rather than while it is in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I did not hear what the Senator from Utah said.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair might as well make a ruling now so as to settle the question.

There is not any Borland amendment here, but there is a certain portion of the text of the bill which has been denominated in the Senate as the Borland amendment. The state of the record is that a motion was made to strike that language from the bill. Pending the motion to strike out, certain amendments were presented and considered and disposed of; two were agreed to and one went out on a point of order. Then subsequently the vote was taken on the motion to strike it out, and it was lost.

The Chair thinks this is the rule, that that ends the matter so far as the consideration by the Senate in Committee of the Whole is concerned; that it had to be amended before the vote was taken upon the question to strike it out; and that after the question to strike out had been once disposed of in Committee of the Whole, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, has exhausted all of its parliamentary right. However, when the bill comes into the Senate that does not prevent the proposal to set aside the rule or a motion to strike out. What the Chair desires to make clear is that it is the opinion of the Chair that so far as this particular language is concerned, it is settled in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand there is no doubt about the fact that the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPARD] gave notice that he would ask for a separate vote upon the Borland amendment in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no doubt in the mind of the Chair that in the Senate a Senator can move to strike it out; he can move to set aside the rule for the purpose of offering an amendment to it, or do what the Senate may please in the matter; but as far as the Committee of the Whole is concerned, it is ended.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I asked the question because I understand the Chair's ruling not to affect a separate vote upon the proposition in the Senate.

Mr. GALLINGER. I assume the Chair rules that without a motion to amend the rule an amendment can be offered to the text in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, certainly. In other words, all the rights are preserved in the Senate, but the rights are gone in Committee of the Whole, as the Chair believes the law to be.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is absolutely right.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Do I understand the Chair holds, then, that it is not in order until the bill is in the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the Senate.

Mr. SHAFROTH. And then it is in order for the purpose of setting aside the rule?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly; every right is preserved in the Senate that obtained in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I should like at this juncture, if in order, to offer an amendment to the bill, on page 15, which I ask the Secretary to read.

The SECRETARY. On page 15, line 9, insert, after the words "Provided further," the following words:

That of the sum thus appropriated \$25,000 may be used for the maintenance of the United States Poultry Feeding and Breeding Experiment Station in the Salt River Valley, Arizona: And provided further.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, just a word in explanation of the amendment.

There is appropriated "for all necessary expenses for investigations and experiments in animal husbandry, for experiments in animal feeding and breeding," and so forth, \$308,680. There is also under one of the provisos of this appropriation \$61,040 appropriated for experiments in poultry feeding and breeding. Inasmuch as the Government has a poultry farm in what is conceded to be the very ideal sort of land needed for the purpose, and in order to carry out that desire on the part of the Government, I have asked for this appropriation. It is immaterial to me whether it is subtracted from the \$61,040 to be used for experiments in poultry feeding or breeding or whether it comes in as a part of the original appropriation.

I will only say that great difficulty has been found in experimenting in the arid country in the raising of poultry with success with the intense heat of the summer months. This is an experiment to meet diseases peculiar to poultry in that condition. Some have made great success where they have gotten a little higher altitude, but the great feeding ground is in an absolute desert country. It is in order to demonstrate that it can be done that this amendment is proposed. I think when we are encouraging the production of wheat by adding 30 cents a bushel to the price guaranteed, we might also see if we can not do something toward the industrial hen, that is a great producer of nutritious food.

Mr. BORAH. Is this adding an additional sum?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No.

Mr. BORAH. It is simply subtracting from the sum already appropriated and designating a certain place where it is to be expended.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. There is a lump sum of \$308,680 appropriated for three or four specified purposes. An exception is made in the bill that \$61,040 may be used for experiments in poultry feeding and breeding. I am only asking that in these experiments this amount shall be given to this particular farm that the Government now has.

Mr. BORAH. The \$25,000?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is right.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know that I get it exactly. Out of this \$61,040 the Senator desires to have \$25,000 set aside for this particular poultry farm?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Yes, sir. I notice that Fremont County, Idaho, gets \$8,000 for the equipment of a sheep experiment station, and as sheep are not one-fifth of the value of the hen product we could multiply it by the amount of the Idaho appropriation.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is unduly sensitive about the Arizona henroost. I was not criticizing it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. No; on the contrary, I am not fearful about my hennery, as long as my friend's constituents stay out of my part of the country. [Laughter.]

Mr. BORAH. I simply wished to know whether it is an additional sum.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I said no; it is not.

Mr. THOMAS. May I interrupt the Senator. I am very glad to know that, because if it were an extra amount it would certainly pass the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am inclined to think so too, but with my own care for public funds I am not asking to go beyond the general appropriation.

Mr. GALLINGER. I had forgotten about this Government appropriation that had been made for investigating the poultry business. Will the Senator state what results have come from it?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I can not state what results have come from it any more than I can from any other specific appropriation in all the appropriation bills.

Mr. GALLINGER. What is the Government trying to do with the hens in Arizona?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I imagine the Government is trying to have the hens lay eggs, and the eggs hatch chickens, and the chickens are sold when people can not get beef.

Mr. GALLINGER. But why in Arizona? Why not in New Hampshire, for instance, or any other State?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Probably New Hampshire ought to have such a station, but I have heard that the conditions there are such that the main question in New Hampshire would be the feeding of the hens. We have no trouble about that in Arizona. It is the diseases we are fighting.

Mr. GALLINGER. Are those diseases peculiar to Arizona?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I think they are. That is my information.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is something of an argument indeed.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is the only ground I put it on.

Mr. GALLINGER. Was that the ground upon which the original appropriation was made?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I presume there was no other reason to make it except that there was a condition there that they wanted to investigate.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is what I have been wanting to find out.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am unable to tell the Senator exactly why the Government started it. I can only say it has started it.

Mr. GALLINGER. If there was a disease in Arizona affecting the poultry that did not exist elsewhere, I can see very clearly that there was reason for the appropriation, and I have been seeking information on that point.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am obliged to the Senator. He displays his usual liberality in these matters touching our part of the country. I can assure the Senator that from my own observation I have seen great numbers of poultry and have noted the effort to raise them at certain times in the intense heat of summer. They lose on the ranches hundreds and hundreds of them, and I imagine, without speaking by the card, that that is the condition that is being attended to.

Mr. GALLINGER. I would repeat my question if the Senator had not told me he had not any information as to what result can come from the use of this money.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I think it is an entirely new proposition. I do not know that such an item was ever in any other appropriation bill, but here is a lump sum appropriated and \$61,040 of it may be used in the investigation of these maladies; and knowing the condition in that part of the country and having letters from a number of people in the community claiming they have met the difficulties of which I am speaking, I have asked that this appropriation be made.

Mr. GALLINGER. All right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, that I may understand the ruling of the Chair with regard to the so-called Borland provision. I offered an amendment, which is lying on the table, to that provision by way of limitation. Do I understand the Chair to hold that that is not in order until we reach the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not until we reach the Senate.

Mr. PITTMAN. I give notice that it will be brought up in the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry. I have not been able to find the Senator that I thought could give me the information privately. The bill contains no provision for the increase of salaries that, I think, it is conceded must be made to all the employees. It was made last year on all the appropriation bills. I did not offer an amendment in the committee and, I think, the committee did not consider it, because they had an understanding that there was a general bill coming over from the other House. I have been told to-day that the Post Office appropriation bill, which has been ordered reported, contains a provision confined to post-office employees.

Mr. WARREN. Since that time the legislative bill has passed the House with a provision covering all.

Mr. NORRIS. It covers all? That is all I wanted to know. If that is true, I have no disposition to offer such an amendment; but we ought not to put this bill in a parliamentary position where that could not be done for the Agricultural Department as well as the other departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Except those that have been reserved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. What amendments have been reserved?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understood other Senators had reserved some amendments. I have not reserved any myself.

Mr. GORE. I desire to have a separate vote on the committee amendment striking out the appropriation for the distribution of valuable seeds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question, then, is on concurring in all the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole that are not reserved. They are concurred in without objection. The Senator from Oklahoma asks for a separate vote on concurring in the amendment which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 27, striking out the provision "for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds," disagreed to in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on striking out the appropriation for the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds, beginning on line 20, page 27.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. May we have a statement by the Chair as to what we are voting on?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate committee reported an amendment striking out the clause of the bill known as the purchase and distribution of valuable seeds embracing two pages and a half. The provision is well known to all Senators. That was disagreed to in Committee of the Whole. The Senator from Oklahoma is now asking for a separate vote as to whether the clause shall be stricken out or not.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I wish to occupy just a moment of the Senate's time. In the debate, when the bill was in Committee of the Whole, I suggested I had been sending seeds which were given to me by the Agricultural Department under the law to the schools largely in my State. I have probably 20 letters in my committee room from children thanking me for sending the seeds and saying that they were being used, that they had results from them last year, and asking me to send them more this year, which I have done.

I believe if the seeds were sent to the schools of every State in the Union we would have results that would be gratifying to everybody and fully justify this small expenditure, if it needed justification. I do not think it needs justification. It is a small appropriation at best. The results, so far as my observations have gone, satisfy me that no better expenditure of a small amount of money can be made than to continue the practice we have followed for so many years.

I received a letter the other day from Bryan, Ohio, which I am going to ask to have read, because it touches upon this question in a very practical way, and with the reading of the letter, if I may be permitted to ask the Secretary to read it, I shall have nothing further to say on the subject, except that I shall continue to vote to retain this appropriation in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

HON. JACOB H. GALLINGER.
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have been greatly interested in the discussion on the Senate floor concerning the free distribution of garden seeds by the Government, and heartily appreciate what you said on the floor March 5, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

Let me take a little of your time, as I know you are a very busy man, to give a little of my personal experience on that score. Some years ago, when I lived in a small town where I was mayor and also justice of the peace, I had our Congressman send me some garden seeds for general distribution. I was pleasantly surprised by receiving a large mail bag full. I apportioned these out so that I could reach every one of the 36 sections in the township, and sent word, without telephone at that, as no system had been installed then, to the parties I had selected to receive the seeds. In each case people of small means, who were good, reliable people, who could not buy seeds as easily as those better financially situated. In three days' time every one of those packages had been called for by the parties I designated, and I had so many more calls for seeds by others that I wrote the Congressman, explaining the matter, and received a lot more. I am sure all those seeds were planted, because in the winter a farmer's wife, an old lady, came to my office and introduced herself, she being a stranger to me, and told me she had never in all her life raised finer radishes than those grown from the seed I had given her husband, that she had heard others expressing themselves as being greatly pleased with the products of the seeds planted and wished me to be sure and get her seeds again in the spring.

This, my dear Senator, is one instance where the free distribution of seeds certainly met the requirements of the Department of Agriculture. Moreover, I never knew of anyone receiving garden seeds, or flower seeds either, for that matter, who did not make use of them and were thankful to get them, for I yet attend to this to some extent.

During the course of my experience as a public-school teacher, I paid particular attention to the agricultural phase. It being one of the prescribed studies, and many a package of agricultural bulletins were selected by my pupils, with their parents' assistance, for home reading, and I had many a copy of what I called the Government horse book sent to interested farmers, also the Yearbook. I generally kept a full set of the bulletins on my desk for use in the agriculture class, also for written work, as essays, drawings, etc. I also had quite a number of the large 5 by 7 foot United States maps distributed and saw that some of them went into schoolrooms. Pupils often wrote to the Congressman asking for documents or books they thought would be of interest to them, and how proud those boys and girls were when they came to school with their mail and showed the kindly letter personally signed by the Congressman, who did not feel above being bothered by the well-meaning youngsters.

You are at liberty to use my letter in any way you deem fit, and in closing would only add that I have not the least idea that at any time any of the Congressmen referred to herein had any thought of politics in administering to our needs.

With kind regards, I remain,

Yours, very sincerely,

U. G. FEGLEY.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I will ask the chairman of the committee what is the amount of this appropriation?

Mr. GORE. It is about a quarter of a million dollars.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the action, as in Committee of the Whole, rejecting the amend-

ment to strike out, reported by the committee. [Putting the question.] [A pause.] The action as in Committee of the Whole is concurred in.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to have the Secretary read a notice which I gave on the 18th instant of my intention to suspend Rule XVI of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The SECRETARY. On March 18 Mr. SHAFROTH gave the following notice:

I hereby give notice in writing that when the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 9054) is being considered in the Senate I shall move to suspend paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of Rule XVI of the Senate, which provide that no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill or to add a new item of appropriation; that amendments proposing to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add new items of appropriation, shall, at least one day before they are considered, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations; and that when actually proposed to the bill no amendment proposing to increase the amount stated in such amendment shall be received, in order that I may propose the following amendment:

On page 91, at the end of line 16, insert the following proviso: "Provided, That work required in excess of eight hours shall be paid for at the rate of one and one-half times the regular compensation of the employee, computed on an hourly basis."

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, the action of the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, was to the effect that an amendment was rejected to strike out what is called the Borland amendment in the House bill, providing that there should be eight hours' service in a day by departmental employees. The law as it now exists provides that there shall be seven hours' service in a day and that the heads of departments shall have the right to require that the clerks or the stenographers shall work any number of hours in excess of that number without pay as the heads of the departments may care to impose.

Mr. GALLINGER rose.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Just a moment, as I desire to get through with this statement.

That leaves the question on the adoption or rejection of an eight-hour day, with the provision of existing law that there shall be a right in the person in charge of a department to require the employee not only to serve eight hours each day, but to serve any number of hours in excess of that number, without receiving any additional compensation. The proposition which is contained in the notice which I have given, and which I shall ask to have voted on, if the rule is suspended, is as follows:

On page 91, at the end of line 16, insert the following proviso: "Provided, That work required in excess of eight hours shall be paid for at the rate of one and one-half times the regular compensation of the employee, computed on an hourly basis."

Now I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was about to ask the Senator if he would not withhold his motion until we take another vote on striking from the bill the so-called Borland provision? I will say to the Senator that I assume, if that provision should be stricken from the bill, it would satisfy him.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I feel that this proposition embodies a true and just compromise of these differences. The idea of requiring people who are working seven hours a day not only to increase that number of hours to eight hours a day, but to require them to work free for hours in excess of eight hours, is something that is wrong. I think the provision which I propose is one to which the majority of the Senate should agree.

Mr. GALLINGER. But does the Senator desire to have the time-and-a-half pay in addition to that of the regular day imposed upon the Government if the present law stands?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not think the present law is right. I think the hours of service should be eight, with extra pay for extra time. That is my judgment with relation to that matter.

Mr. GALLINGER. If that is the Senator's view, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in relation to my amendment, as I presume the amendment itself will be discussed under the motion to suspend the rules.

There has been a great controversy in the world at large, including the United States, as to the length of time that men ought to work each day. That matter has been the subject of agitation for hundreds of years. There has been, of course, a diminution of the number of hours which it had been thought best should constitute a working day. There was a time when 12 hours and even 14 hours were thought to be the proper working day for persons engaged in all kinds of labor, but the general consensus of opinion has about arrived at the conclusion that an 8-hour day is best for the employer and is also best for the employee.

In the matter of health, there is no question but that a reasonable amount of labor is requisite and that a diminution of the numerous hours of labor is necessary. That being the

case, we ought to make the hours of labor as nearly uniform as we can.

We find that labor organizations have invariably insisted upon an eight-hour day. We know that is the ruling working day throughout the United States in almost all occupations. It creates discontent if some people work only seven hours and receive a full day's pay for doing so. Consequently, it is natural that those employees of the Government who work eight hours should insist that it is not fair to them that they should only have the same compensation as those who work only seven hours a day. Inasmuch as the Government ought to get good service and ought to get a fair day's service, it seems to me that what we ought to do is to amend the provision which is now in the bill and to so frame it that a provision for eight hours shall prevail, and that there shall be allowed time and a half for extra time which may be required of the employee.

The beneficial effects of that, it seems to me, must be plain to everybody. If a stenographer or clerk is required to return to the department after supper, he is not going to do that voluntarily or cheerfully; he is not going to perform good work when he has probably been disturbed in what he thinks is his right. On that account it seems to me that by the adoption of this amendment you will create contentment upon the part of the men and the women who perform this labor and you will get good work, because labor cheerfully performed is always good labor.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, in that connection I desire to suggest to the Senator that it is always, or usually at least, the case that the most competent clerks, those out of whom they can get the best work in the departments, are those who will be called on to work overtime without compensation. It is those men who will be required to work extra hours, and then to have responsibility thrown upon them long after the others have gone.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I thank the Senator from Arizona for the statement. The amendment which is to be proposed, if the rule is suspended, will give the Government one hour's more time from its employees. Consequently, it is in the interest of economy; it is something that we ought to take into consideration, in view of the existing conditions which have been created by reason of the war. There is no doubt that extra time is necessary at certain periods, and especially during the present time, when work of an immense volume may have to be done at any moment. I believe the employees ought to be required to work eight hours and that they ought, in addition, to be required to work more than eight hours when it is necessary that they should do so; but, Mr. President, it is absurd to say that we shall have people coming down to the departments at night and performing work that is not within the ordinary eight hours and that they should receive no compensation whatever for performing it. That creates discontent; it makes dissatisfaction.

If there is any question of fewer hours' work, it makes those who have to perform eight hours' work say that their salary ought to be raised, because the people who work seven hours do not have to do as much work as they do. So, taking it all in all, the uniformity of a rule for eight hours' work is something which, it seems to me, would have an excellent effect upon the amount of work that can be done and also upon the contentment of the people who perform that work.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It is also in line with the general rule.

Mr. SHAFROTH. As the Senator from Arizona suggests, it is in line with the rule which has been recognized and established as the proper day for people to work in all occupations.

Mr. President, objection has been made to the amendment upon the ground that it would require extra compensation and an extra appropriation, and that by reason of that fact it is contrary to the rule of the Senate. This motion, however, is for the very purpose of avoiding that. It is very doubtful whether there will be any extra compensation required, because these extra hours of work may complete all the work to be done. Consequently there will probably be no extra pay by reason of it; and if there should be, then, in my judgment, it ought to be paid for.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Has the Senator from Colorado considered the question as to whether or not it would be better to allow extra pay for the extra hours rather than to give extra leave for the extra work done, in the latter case equalizing the entire year's work at eight hours a day?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I heard the Senator from Georgia speak in behalf of his amendment to the effect which he has just stated, and I am willing to say that in my judgment his

amendment is better than no amendment at all. But there ought to be an inducement to the employees—the stenographers and the clerks—by which, when they are called upon to perform extra labor, it will not be counted as a leave for them in the future, but a direct compensation and benefit to them at the time the service is performed.

You will then find that clerks will come down to the departments cheerfully to perform extra work; you will find that the inconvenience of coming after dinner will not be considered great; and that there will be cheerful and contented employees performing this work.

Then, Mr. President, we shall find that there will be no protests on the part of anyone engaged in business affairs on the outside. They will not contend that the Government is not getting a good day's work; that it is a sinecure to get into a Government job, when they know that eight hours' work has to be performed. They will recognize and realize that the Government is getting full compensation for the amount paid to its clerks and other employees.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to ask the Senator if he has made any provision in his amendment for anyone to look after and to keep an account of this overtime, so that the heads of departments or the auditors may know how much employees ought to be paid for overtime?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I take it that nearly all of the departments now have officials who keep accurate time accounts of the arrival and departure of each one of the employees. I understand that is done in all the departments; and the failure of an employee to report on time, if he be even only five minutes late, is noted, and consequently must be made up in some way.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator make that statement from personal knowledge or from hearsay?

Mr. SHAFROTH. From hearsay.

Mr. THOMAS. I am very much surprised to hear that any one of the departments exhibits such a degree of efficiency as that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My understanding is that each foreman of a room, for the purpose of making up his efficiency report, which is very important in the consideration of the promotion or demotion of employees, keeps the time of the employees as well as notes concerning their vigilance, fidelity, and so forth. Otherwise efficiency reports could not well be made.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I know of a number of employees who are always exceedingly anxious to get to their offices on the minute set by the department for the beginning of work.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. I think, if the Senator will investigate, he will find that not only is the time kept with great accuracy and great stringency, but, in at least one department that I know of, if the operator of a machine strikes a single letter wrong, it constitutes a mark against him. I think it will be found that at least nearly all of the old departments have rules that are sufficiently rigid. In the newly organized departments and bureaus, which are still in a transitory or creative condition, there may be some laxity; but I do not think you will find that to be the case in the old departments.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. KIRBY. Does the Senator understand that any department keeps a record of time lost by its employees and requires the employees to make up that time?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I understand so; yes. I know several employees who are as anxious as can be to reach their desks at the appointed time, for otherwise there would be a mark against them, and they will be required to make up the lost time or have a demerit mark placed against them.

Mr. KIRBY. If, as the Senator and as some others seem to think, a man or a woman should not do more than eight hours of work in one of these departments, why would it not be well to say they shall work only eight hours a day?

Mr. SHAFROTH. The reason I object to that is that we are at war, and it may be necessary at times to require employees to stay at their work all night; and they should stay there all night, if it is necessary.

Mr. KIRBY. Why could not others be employed to do the night work?

Mr. SHAFROTH. That would involve the employment of persons unfamiliar with the routine of the work required, and therefore there would no doubt be great inefficiency.

Mr. KIRBY. Then, eight hours a day is not as much work as anybody can do efficiently at all, provided you pay them time and a half for overtime?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Eight hours in the long run, year in and year out, is, in my judgment, the proper standard for daily hours of labor; but, Mr. President, pressure of business, the fact that something may come up which it is absolutely requisite to attend to promptly, makes it necessary that on occasions employees should work longer than eight hours. It is not going to injure a person for one night or two nights or ten nights to perform extra work, but the work should be done voluntarily and cheerfully; and it is impossible to get it done cheerfully unless extra compensation is given to the employee who is required to work extra hours. For that reason I believe that there should be provision made for overtime payment.

I want to say one further thing with relation to the appropriation. There has been a protest against the proposed amendment on the ground that it is difficult, if not impossible, to estimate how much money should be appropriated. Why, Mr. President, it is unnecessary to provide for that now. There are probably more deficiency appropriation bills presented to the Congress of the United States in these days than any other kind of measures. The first bill that we passed in the extra session appropriated \$7,750,000,000 for deficiencies, and we passed another deficiency bill just a short time ago carrying over a billion dollars. Consequently, if it should develop that a larger amount of money is required to meet extra pay, it can be provided for under deficiency bills. It can also be covered in another way. There can be appropriated in the bill which provides for the salaries of the various officers of the United States a lump sum for the very purpose of meeting the extra compensation which may be paid. So that there is absolutely nothing, it seems to me, that would prevent the fair and effective operation of this proposed amendment.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WARREN. Does not the Senator think that the few times when the clerks may be called upon to work extra hours may well be charged up against the 60 days leave—30 days for general leave and 30 days for sick leave—during the year?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, Mr. President, that has been disputed; they do not have 60 days vacation.

Mr. WARREN. Just a moment. I do not believe that there has ever been a time, either under the stress of war or otherwise, when, as a class, the employees of any department have been called upon to work over hours to an extent that would exceed the real number of hours for which they are paid; in other words, the 60 days allowed them for regular leave and for sick leave.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Well, Mr. President, there is a possibility of 60 days leave, but nothing but 30 days is assured. The law provides that sick leave may be granted if the employee is actually sick or some member of his family requires his attention. In that event the employees can receive 30 days sick leave in excess of the 30 days regular leave; but that is not a leave of 60 days. The only leave that is given that is certain is a vacation leave of 30 days. I believe that is fair; I believe that is just; I believe it is proper; and when we consider the fact that these employees may be called upon quite frequently, especially during the period of the war, to perform extra services, it seems to me it would be an outrage to require them to work eight hours and then require them to work overtime without any extra compensation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator has made a statement that is inaccurate; that is either the case or else my information is inaccurate. My understanding is that the clerks do not receive 30 days' vacation as a matter of right at all.

Mr. WARREN. It is a matter of absolute law, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. REED. No; I think that they receive not to exceed 30 days, and that the head of a department regulates that. I may be in error; but that is the information that has been conveyed to me.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I have understood the rule to be that they are entitled to 30 days' leave without anything more than the filing of an application for that leave.

Mr. WARREN. They are by law entitled to 30 days' regular leave and national holidays.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Thirty days and holidays; that is right.

Mr. WARREN. And also sick leave.

Mr. SHAFROTH. When it comes to sick leave, then the employee must be actually sick or must come within the statute permitting such leave if a member of his family is sick and requires his attention.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield.

Mr. KIRBY. Is it contemplated in the Senator's amendment that if eight hours is not required to discharge effectively the work of the office, the employee shall not be given eight hours' pay for that day, but shall make up the time on the next day?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no; the requirement is that the employees shall work eight hours a day.

Mr. KIRBY. Suppose it is not necessary to have them work eight hours in order to perform the work?

Mr. SHAFROTH. It will be found that all the departments are behind in their work. There is no danger of that being the case, and in the event a condition should arise whereby they were not required to work eight hours the force could be diminished and the work made to go around so as to keep all employed for eight hours.

Mr. WARREN. They usually get half a day on Saturday all through the summer, do they not?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; they get half a day on Saturdays in the hot weather; but everybody else gets the same. Mr. President, it has been found that if those who work do not have the benefit of a limited number of hours, and do not receive the benefit of some sort of a vacation, they will have to take weeks or will have to take months, and sometimes will have to take years, to recuperate their condition. It has been recognized by physicians and by the highest authorities upon such subjects that 8 hours of labor and 30 days' vacation in the summer is a reasonable schedule.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the object of the motion to suspend the rules is simply to give an opportunity to the Senate to vote, notwithstanding the rules, to modify the Borland amendment as it passed the other House. The present condition of things is this: A clerk is required to work seven hours; and the Senator from Arkansas need not concern himself about his being required to work at least seven hours, except upon holidays and during his vacation. Then, too, a clerk may be called upon to work more hours, as the exigencies of the service may require, without compensation. Hitherto, considering the fact that he did not perform an ordinary day's work, but worked only seven hours, it was thought to be negligible to insert a provision for extra pay. Now, the House adopts and sends to the Senate a provision to make the clerks work eight hours a day. I think that they ought to work eight hours; I think that public employees ought to give a full day's work, just like employees of corporations or of individuals; but I think that when they are made to do that that they ought to be put upon the same footing as other laborers.

I therefore introduced the motion to give them time and a half extra pay for extra time. That motion was ruled out on a point of order. That left the Senate in this situation: It had either to adopt the Borland amendment as it came from the House or reject it. The Senate had no initiative of its own, no volition of its own, as to how the eight-hour law should be modified, limited, or framed. An appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair, and the Senate sustained the Chair. That settled that question.

I think that these employees ought to be made to give a fair day's work for a fair day's pay; and I think that eight hours is a fair day's work. The labor unions and the workmen in the United States have all said that they would be satisfied with that; but under the present system obtaining in the departments a clerk working seven hours can be worked over seven hours without extra pay; and, with the Borland amendment, merely changing the number of hours from seven to eight, they are left in the situation where if the provision of the House bill becomes a law they can be worked over eight hours without any extra pay.

While I contend that eight hours is a fair day's work, I also contend that more than eight hours is overwork for almost anybody in any sort of business of this description or in any sort of manual labor for that matter. I suppose the Senate understands the situation; but being a Senator myself I can not resist the temptation to add perfume to the violet and to make the red of the rose still redder, and therefore have attempted to explain the sole object of the motion, which is to give the Senate itself a chance to say whether it wants the amendment or not, it having been deprived of that chance by the technical rule.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I shall only detain the Senate for a moment. I think we are falling into rather a bad habit in that whenever an amendment is offered which is subject to a point of order we move to suspend the rules so as to make it in order. We have occupied several days discussing one motion of that kind, and I presume we shall occupy a day in

discussing the pending motion, and pretty soon we shall be spending half our time in controversies over suspending the rules. I have never voted to suspend the rules, and will not do so unless there is involved a matter of great importance to the country.

Now, as regards this matter, I voted against the motion of the Senator from Texas to strike out the so-called Borland amendment. I have changed my mind on that question; and, if the Senator from Texas renews that motion, I shall vote for it, because I believe it is the easiest way to settle this question.

There are certain uncontroverted points in this controversy. The clerks are a favored class; they get 30 days' leave of absence, and they all take it; they get 30 days' sick leave, and some of them take a part of it; they get holidays with pay. There is no other class of laborers in the United States that have those privileges; so that it ought not to be made to appear here that the Government clerks are being oppressed in any way. They are satisfied with the law as it stands. I have had, I think, at least 50 letters protesting against the Borland amendment, and saying that the clerks are perfectly satisfied with the law as it stands. Why not leave it in that shape? Why not strike out the provision in the bill, the so-called Borland amendment, and let matters go along as they are at present?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The very ground upon which my motion is based is that there should be more time given by the clerks, more service performed; and, eight hours being a reasonable requirement, that that standard should be fixed; but when the clerks are called upon to work extra hours extra pay should be allowed them.

I will say to the Senator that the amendment I have proposed is perfectly satisfactory to the employees, particularly in view of the fact that they do not work only seven hours, but in many cases are required to work eight hours or more a day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the Senator may be well informed; but I have had numerous letters protesting against the eight-hour amendment and asking that it shall not be agreed to. I do not think the clerks are satisfied with it. They are satisfied with the present condition as it exists to-day. I have not heard a whisper of complaint along that line.

Another thing, Mr. President. These clerks are employed by the year, at \$1,000, \$1,080, \$1,100, \$1,200, \$1,400, and so on. If we are to pay them upon the same basis that workmen are paid in the factories of the United States, it will be necessary to have a ledger account entered into with every clerk, and the hours and the minutes that they work overtime will have to be reckoned. It will require a force to do that. The Government service is not suffering. They have called to this city about 10,000 clerks, and I do not know but 20,000 clerks, within the last few weeks, and they are all glad to come here. Many of them are getting twice as much here as they would get at home. While I sympathize with them in every right that they ought to have, I do not think we ought to become hysterical over this thing. Inasmuch as they are satisfied with the existing law, it seems to me that what we ought to do is to agree to the motion made by the Senator from Texas, to strike out the so-called Borland amendment and let the law remain as it is at the present time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I have here the law on the subject of vacation and sick leave. I quote from the United States Compiled Statutes, 1916, page 96:

Provided further, That the head of any department may grant 30 days' annual leave with pay in any one year to each clerk or employee: *And provided further*, That where some member of the immediate family of a clerk or employee is afflicted with a contagious disease and requires the care and attendance of such employee, or where his or her presence in the department would jeopardize the health of fellow clerks, and in exceptional and meritorious cases where a clerk or employee is personally ill and where to limit the annual leave to 30 days in any one calendar year would work peculiar hardship it may be extended, in the discretion of the head of the department, with pay, not exceeding 30 days in any one case or in any one calendar year.

The clerks do not have this leave as a matter of right. It is simply a matter of discretion on the part of the head of the department.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator knows very well, however, that it is taken every year, and has been allowed for a great many years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am informed by many clerks that many of them do not get it at all.

Mr. WARREN. They do not ask for it then.

Mr. SMOOT. If they do not ask for it they do not get it. There is no clerk of the Government that ever asks for his 30 days leave of absence but that he gets it. He is entitled to it under the law, and he ought to get it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. He is not entitled to it, because the law says he is not entitled to it.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; he is entitled to it, just exactly the same as in the case of the seven-hour provision of the law. That was suggestive on the part of Congress, and the heads of the departments obeyed it; and this is suggestive, and the heads of the departments have obeyed it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The provision for seven hours' work a day is made obligatory.

Mr. SMOOT. Not at all, as the Senator will see if he reads the law.

Mr. SHEPPARD (reading)—

Hereafter it shall be the duty of the heads of the several executive departments, in the interest of the public service, to require of all clerks and other employees, of whatever grade or class, in their respective departments, not less than seven hours of labor each day.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, well, yes; not less than seven hours.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The seven-hour provision is obligatory as a minimum.

Mr. SMOOT. I was speaking about the question of working over the seven hours. There is not anything obligatory on the part of the head of any department to compel them to work more than seven hours.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is true.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I do not see that it is any argument against this provision that the clerks have a holiday or that they have certain hours of vacation. The fact is that very few of these clerks are worked overtime. That is an absolute fact; but that does not relieve the clerks who are worked overtime. As a matter of fact, there are just a few clerks in each department who are so skilled that it is worth while to work them overtime, and those poor clerks are worked nearly to death.

I know of instances by personal knowledge where clerks have been worked 12 hours a day, and are worked 12 hours a day now, because they are familiar with the work and no one else is. It is no answer to such a clerk to say that 99 per cent of the other clerks work only 8 hours or 7 hours. It is no answer to such a clerk to say that everybody gets 30 days' vacation. He is working 12 hours, and he is working 12 hours because the department, unfortunately, has to have him work 12 hours.

The situation is this, as has been suggested: Those that are not efficient are worked only 7 hours and those that are efficient are worked 12 hours; and because 99 per cent of them are worked only 7 hours and have a holiday, therefore the other 1 per cent have to work 12 hours without any difference in their compensation. Now, is that fair?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that what he has stated is absolutely correct. I stated on the floor of the Senate the other day that I did not think 1 per cent of the clerks in the Government employ were working over 7 hours per day.

Mr. PITTMAN. I think the Senator from Utah is right.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want the Senator to know that I am not opposing ample pay for the clerks of the Government. That I want them to have, and I shall vote for it whenever I get a chance to do so, although I know that it ought to be provided for in a different way than we are going to do it by voting a horizontal increase. That is unscientific and never will be satisfactory. But I want to say to the Senator now that the clerks who are working 12 hours to-day are the most efficient clerks in the employment of the Government, as he has already stated, and they are the ones that are going to get the efficiency marks; they are the ones that are going to get the promotions as soon as the promotions possibly can be made by the head of the department; and that happens every week and every month of the year.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, that is something like the reward hereafter. I am satisfied that some of us here are going to get rewarded hereafter; but the only scientific way to pay a man for something he does is to pay him while he does it instead of hoping that at some time somebody will promote him so that he can get a fair wage.

Mr. SMOOT. I know that that is what they will get, and I think it is right that they should get it. I think they are the ones that ought to be taken care of the very first moment the head of the department can promote them; and all of the departments, so far as I know, are following that policy.

Mr. PITTMAN. The main object in the time-and-a-half provision is not to pay extra wages. It is to prevent people from unnecessarily working a man longer than he should work. That is the reason of it. No man is going to pay time and a half for extra-hour work unless the employee's services are absolutely necessary. On the other hand, many careless foremen will work a man overtime if it does not cost anything or does not detract from the foreman's own record. This will cost the Government practically nothing, because I should say only 1

per cent or less of these people are now worked overtime. It will not cost the Government anything; but we have just as much of a duty imposed on us to protect the 1 per cent as we have to protect the 99 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit a suggestion for my own information—because I do not claim to know anything about it—can not the Senator conceive of a condition as to a future reward along this line: Are not some of these clerks in the departments of such efficiency in their present positions that the mere fact of their being indispensable in those positions would of itself prevent them from getting a higher place, because it would be robbing the one in power of the very service he needed?

Mr. PITTMAN. I have known a transfer to be refused to another department by reason of the necessity of a clerk in a particular department. I have asked for transfers from one department because they were working certain employees 12 hours a day, and the answer was that they had to have those particular employees.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the present law provides that seven hours shall constitute a minimum day's work. To say that we should enact a law compelling the clerks to work an additional hour without additional pay would simply be to say to these clerks that they are getting overpaid.

I voted for the so-called Borland amendment as amended by the Senate. When it came to the Senate it provided for an hour's increase, with no limitation. The Senate has amended the Borland amendment by providing that it shall be only for the period of the war; and, of course, the amendment which will be proposed by the Senator from Colorado, so far as the increase is concerned, would apply only to the period of the war.

I felt, Mr. President, that during the war we ought to ask the clerks to work eight hours; but if we ask them to work eight hours, and if they do work eight hours, we ought to give them additional pay. For that reason I shall vote for the motion of the Senator from Colorado to suspend the rule so as to give the Senate the right to vote as to whether or not we shall increase the pay.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the Senate suspend paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of Rule XVI in order that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH] may present, in order, the amendment proposed by him?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I suggest that we had better have a quorum.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That will bring a quorum.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Because of my general pair with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] I withhold my vote.

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON], who is unavoidably absent. At his special request I observe the pair upon this question and withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. As he is not in the Chamber I withhold my vote.

Mr. KELLOGG (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS]. As he is not in the Chamber I withhold my vote.

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent on account of sickness in his family. I am informed that if he were present he would vote for the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. As he is absent I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Repeating my announcement of my pair and its transfer, which announcement I ask may stand for the day, I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MYERS. Has the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with that Senator. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HARDING. I inquire if the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. HARDING. I have a general pair with that Senator and in his absence I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CALDER. I am paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (after having voted in the negative). The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] with whom I am paired is absent. I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SAULSBURY] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLE]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The roll call resulted—yeas 33, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Ashurst	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Shields
Baird	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Smith, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Kellogg	Page	Thompson
Cummins	Knox	Phelan	Townsend
Gore	Lodge	Pittman	Watson
Gronna	McKellar	Pointdexter	Williams
Hale	McNary	Shafroth	
Henderson	New	Sheppard	
Johnson, Cal.	Norris	Sherman	

NAYS—24.

Curtis	King	Robinson	Swanson
Fletcher	Kirby	Simmons	Tillman
France	Martin	Smith, Ga.	Vardaman
Gallinger	Overman	Smith, Mich.	Wadsworth
Hardwick	Pomeroy	Smoot	Warren
Hitchcock	Ransdell	Stone	Wolcott

NOT VOTING—38.

Bankhead	Fernald	La Follette	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Sterling
Borah	Gerry	McCumber	Sutherland
Brandegee	Goff	McLean	Thomas
Broussard	Harding	Myers	Trammell
Calder	Hollis	Nelson	Underwood
Cole	James	Penrose	Walsh
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reed	Weeks
Dillingham	Kendrick	Saulsbury	
Fall	Kenyon	Smith, Md.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Less than two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the motion is lost.

Mr. PITTMAN. I offer the amendment that I offered in the Committee of the Whole and reserved for consideration in the Senate, and ask for a vote on it. I ask that it may be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 91, at the end of line 16, after the word "day," it is proposed to insert "or to pay salaries of the heads of executive departments having charge of the employment of labor who require more than eight hours' labor of an employee each day, unless such employee is paid at the rate of time and a half for each hour over eight hours."

Mr. GORE. I make the point of order that the proposed amendment is general legislation.

Mr. GALLINGER. And is not estimated for.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I now renew my motion to strike out lines 10 to 16, inclusive, on page 91, as amended; and on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Texas if this is a motion to strike out what is known as the Borland amendment?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I am glad that we have at last gotten that far in this matter.

Mr. President, I said before, and I wish to reiterate, that I voted for the eight-hour law. I voted to suspend the rules and put on the bill the provision giving pay and a half for the additional time over the eight hours required under that amendment. I was extremely anxious to see the labor at Washington equalized with the other labor of the country and to have the rule prevail here that prevails generally in all systems of organized labor in my part of the country as well as in the East. I was desirous, also, to see time and a half paid for overtime. Inasmuch as that effort has failed in getting remuneration for the clerks for the hours of labor after others have quit, I shall vote to strike out this amendment, because under it, without that provision, I think it unfair not only to the Government in requiring this extraordinary labor but very unfair to the men themselves who have to bear that burden.

I shall, therefore, with this explanation, change the vote I gave before.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CALDER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]. On this question he would vote in the affirmative. I also shall vote that way. I therefore vote "yea."

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). Because of my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], and not knowing how he would vote upon this question, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. FALL (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as on the previous roll call and withhold my vote.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. As he is not in the Chamber, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. HARDING (when his name was called). I note the absence of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with whom I have a general pair. Being unable to secure a transfer, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD]. Being unable to get a transfer, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. GRONNA (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). I desire to make the same announcement as before, that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. I am also informed that if present he would vote in the affirmative.

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], who is absent. I do not know how he would vote on this question if present. I am not able to obtain a transfer of my pair, and therefore withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). Announcing my pair as on the last vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SUTHERLAND (when his name was called). The junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] appears to be absent. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. In his absence I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I am unable to obtain a transfer, and therefore withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I am informed the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], with whom I have a pair, would if present vote "yea" upon this proposition. I therefore feel at liberty to vote the same way without any transfer. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and vote "yea."

Mr. WEEKS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] to the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] and vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and I vote "yea."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]; and

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—40.

Ashurst	Hardwick	Martin	Shields
Baird	Henderson	Overman	Simmons
Calder	Hitchcock	Owen	Smith, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Johnson, Cal.	Phelan	Smith, Mich.
Curtis	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Stone
Dillingham	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell	Sutherland
France	King	Reed	Swanson
Gallinger	Knox	Robinson	Thompson
Gronna	McKellar	Sheppard	Williams
Hale	McNary	Sherman	Wolcott

NAYS—23.			
Borah	Lodge	Polindexter	Vardaman
Cummins	Myers	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Fletcher	New	Shafroth	Warren
Gore	Norris	Smith, Ga.	Watson
Kellogg	Nugent	Smoot	Weeks
Kirby	Page	Townsend	
NOT VOTING—32.			
Bankhead	Frelinghuysen	Kenyon	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Gerry	La Follette	Smith, S. C.
Brandeggee	Goff	Lewis	Sterling
Broussard	Harding	McCumber	Thomas
Colt	Hollis	McLean	Tillman
Culberson	James	Nelson	Trammell
Fall	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Underwood
Fernald	Kendrick	Saulsbury	Walsh

So Mr. SHEPPARD's motion to strike out was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I desire to offer an amendment, suggested by the Department of Agriculture.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 11, page 90, insert:

Any moneys hereafter received in payment of charges fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture on account of such cleaning and disinfection at plants constructed therefor out of any appropriation made on account of the pink bollworm of cotton to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GORE. I move the adoption of the amendment which I send to the desk, also prepared in the Department of Agriculture and sent to me. It is a companion to the amendment just adopted.

The SECRETARY. On page 91, after line 9, insert:

And provided further, That not to exceed 10 per cent of the foregoing amounts appropriated for the eradication of the pink bollworm of cotton shall be available interchangeably in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture among the several items under that head.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator if he desires that amendment to be adopted? I notice that now all the departments are beginning to suggest the same thing in almost every lump-sum appropriation. I do not believe that it is good policy for Congress to undertake that way of legislating. I think whenever a department asks for an appropriation they ought to ask for what they really need, and there should be no part of it transferred to some other purpose. I do not believe the Senate ought to adopt the amendment.

Mr. GORE. I will say to the Senator that a provision like this is in the bill, but it relates to preceding appropriations and not to succeeding appropriations. It happened that the appropriation for the pink bollworm follows that provision which relates only to preceding appropriations. I will say to the Senator we had an amendment reported by the committee that the funds used in this inspection should be revolving funds. That was stricken out by the Senate. Now, that renders the appropriation insufficient, in view of the fact that it does not revolve, but has to be covered into the Treasury, and it would render the amount inadequate. This is intended to meet that situation. Otherwise the work of disinfecting these cars coming from Mexico, from which we import the bollworm, can not go forward. The funds might be exhausted before the end of the fiscal year. I think, in this case at least, there ought to be an exception made.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course hearing an amendment read from the desk and not having any chance at all to see it, it is almost impossible to judge of the effect of the amendment. I was speaking against the principle. It began two years ago, and it is being followed up now by all the departments, and it ought to cease.

Mr. GORE. I think the Senator is right about it, generally speaking.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. ASHURST. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 8696, the Indian appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8696) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

Mr. STONE. I ask the Senator from Arizona to allow the bill to be laid aside for the present.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be temporarily laid aside.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, March 22, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 21, 1918.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Lemuel E. Lindsay to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 5th day of June, 1917.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 7th day of March, 1918:

Frank H. Luckel and

Ralph F. Wood.

Ensign Robert H. Maury to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy from the 7th day of December, 1917.

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 15th day of October, 1917:

Robert E. Hoyt,

John F. Murphy, and

Jesse W. Backus.

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, from the 1st day of January, 1918:

Clarence F. Ely and

Perceval S. Rossiter.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, from the 15th day of October, 1917:

Harry A. Garrison,

Henry L. Dollard,

Earle P. Huff,

Harry R. Hermesesch, and

Harry L. Smith.

Assistant Civil Engineer David G. Copeland to be a civil engineer in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 27th day of February, 1918.

Carpenter Edgar S. Covey to be a chief carpenter in the Navy from the 26th day of March, 1915.

Pay Clerk Walter A. Thomas to be a chief pay clerk in the Navy from the 12th day of October, 1917.

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of March, 1918:

Charles C. Roberts,

Charles L. Allen,

Guy A. Walker,

Nicholas Kedinger,

Percy C. Becker,

Stockard R. Hickey,

Alfred E. Stulb,

Walter Hinton,

George B. Kessack,

Oscar Erickson,

John J. Bayer,

Oscar F. Bandura,

Guy McLaughlin,

Russell G. McNaughton,

Eduard G. Jahnke,

Otto Beran,

David J. Spahr,

William E. McClendon,

Fred S. Wade, and

John W. Collier.

The following-named enlisted men to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of March, 1918:

Enos Dahuff,

Delos A. Humphrey,

William J. Sharkey,

George H. Charter,

Edward Reavely,

Niels Andersen,

Howard C. Heald,

Robert S. Dunn,

Lawrence E. Myers,

Robert S. Smith, jr.,

John E. Hatch,

Frederick Shea,
Clarence J. Gale,
Albert Nashman,
Charles E. Olson,
Robert Martin, and
William S. Quesinberry.

The following-named ensigns of the United States Naval Reserve Force to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of March, 1918:

James C. White,
Edward Reynolds, jr., and
Henry O. Rea.

The following-named ensigns of the National Naval Volunteers to be ensigns in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of March, 1918:

Robert W. Rose,
Matthew L. Kelly, and
Freeman J. Condon.

Medical Inspector Frank L. Pleadwell to be a medical director in the Navy with the rank of captain, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February, 1918.

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February, 1918:

Charles E. Ryder,
Allen D. McLean, and
Frederick G. Abeken.

Pay Clerk Roy E. Barrett to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, for temporary service, from the 1st day of January, 1918.

Carpenter Edgar S. Covey to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1917.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 21, 1918.

JUDGE OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Milton Strasburger to be judge of the municipal court, District of Columbia.

DISTRICT JUDGE.

Edwin Louis Garvin to be United States district judge, eastern district of New York.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Claude R. Porter to be United States attorney, southern district of Iowa.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Nicholas F. Reed to be United States marshal, southern district of Iowa.

SURVEYORS GENERAL.

Lucius Dills to be surveyor general of New Mexico.
Ingwald C. Thoresen to be surveyor general of Utah.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John V. Killion to be receiver of public moneys at Dodge City, Kans.

Edward J. Hughes to be receiver of public moneys at Dickinson, N. Dak.

Albert F. Young to be receiver of public moneys at Vernal, Utah.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Frank Langley to be register of the land office at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

Peter Hanson to be register of the land office at Vernal, Utah.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

P. D. Wootten, Abbeville.
L. W. Stanford, Hamilton.
Flem C. Dame, Homerville.
P. Brooks Ford, Sylvester.
Sanford P. Darby, Vidalia.
Mary P. Dixon, West Point.

OKLAHOMA.

J. P. Ford, Konawa.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Frederic P. Laub, Bath.
John F. Henry, Cresco.

RHODE ISLAND.

James A. Wright, Wakefield.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate March 21, 1918.

M. B. Hickman to be postmaster at Coalgate, Okla.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, March 21, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Father in Heaven, for that finer, purer, nobler spirit, pouring itself out in a thousand kind, generous, philanthropic, altruistic, and God-like methods, to alleviate the widespread suffering thrust into the world by the ruthless and brutal methods of the enemies of civil, political, and religious liberty.

Grant, O most merciful Father, that out of it all shall come a larger, purer, grander civilization, which shall transform every child of the living God into a good Samaritan, through that love which poured itself out on the cross of Calvary for a sinful world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolution of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a memorial in Washington to the memory and in honor of the members of the various orders of sisters who gave their services as nurses on battle fields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals during the Civil War.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting an address recently delivered by the governor of Louisiana, Hon. R. G. Pleasant.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting an address recently delivered by Gov. Pleasant. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RENTALS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

Mr. LITTLE. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. It will take only three minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a letter which I received this morning, which I wish to read to the House. I read:

"WITH THE COLORS."
WALTER REED GENERAL HOSPITAL,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1918.

Representative JOHNSON.

DEAR SIR: I wish to complain to you about the rent profiteering in Washington.

I am a sergeant in the Aviation Corps and in the hospital with a broken leg. My wife is living in a house at 73 New York Avenue, owned by Mrs. Kearnon, 71 New York Avenue. Prior to March 1 the rent was \$35. Now the rent is \$60 a month for the upstairs and \$50 for three rooms downstairs. Now my rent is raised and my wife is to be put out April 1, because my wife is to be a mother soon, and Mrs. Kearnon is taking advantage of my being in the hospital.

Yours, respectfully,

Sergt. NEWELL F. JOHNSTONE.

I also have a letter, received this morning, from an old woman, which I will read. I might say, in advance of the reading of this letter, that this is from a woman 76 years old, who is a widow of a Union soldier, and it is not so legibly written or so well expressed as Lord Macaulay might do it. But I will read it just as it is:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 20, 1918.

Hon. BEN JOHNSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I being in much trouble regarding my home, having occupied same one year and seven months at rental \$25 per month, in advance usually paid. I have been notified by agent in charge to vacate premises by April 15, 1918, next month, without any reason given. Six weeks ago agent raised my rent \$10.50 more than been paying, by notice given in less than two weeks; came to my home saying my rent would be \$25 as before, only I believed he feared trouble by some of you in authority.

I am a Civil War widow, self-supporting, 76 years old. I would be glad to confer with you and learn if anything can be done. Am unable to find another house, and must I be put out on the street? Please oblige, answer.

Yours, truly,

Mrs. C. C. ABBOTT.

With that letter, Mr. Speaker, is another sheet of paper, at the top of which is pasted a slip bearing the following:

Daniel J. Sullivan, real estate, loans, and insurance, 412 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

On this additional sheet of paper the old lady adds:

Address and name of agent in charge of home.
I would call and bring other evidence if desired.
I trust you may find some one who will take the matter up, that right may prevail and I not suffer wrongly.

Yours, sincerely,

Mrs. C. C. ABBOTT.

It has been stated so often that the owners of private property are not profiteering; that tenants only—

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. I would like to ask the gentleman if the persons who gave these men and women notice to vacate property are the owners of the property?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. As I was about to say, these letters giving notice to quit clearly appear to be from owners and not from tenants, who are charged by owners as doing practically all of the profiteering.

Mr. KEARNS. The reason I wanted to ask that question is, as I recall the testimony submitted to the House the other day on the part of the Real Estate Exchange, that it was to the effect that all the profiteering rents in this city came from tenants who were subleasing, and, according to that testimony, this letter contradicts the statement of the Board of Exchange.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Yes. I have called attention to these letters because they recite facts about merciless and pitiless owners.

INSURANCE FOR PRISONERS OF WAR.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and pass at this time Senate joint resolution 133.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 133. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, let the resolution be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read Senate joint resolution 133, authorizing the granting of insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, on application by a person other than the person to be insured, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That insurance under the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended by the act approved October 6, 1917, shall be granted by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance on application made by the person to be insured or, subject to such regulations as the bureau may prescribe, by any other person.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the purpose of this resolution is primarily to extend the protection of the insurance to those who have been taken prisoners of war, and who therefore can not avail themselves of its benefits under the present law. The gentleman proposes to offer an amendment to specify that special purpose?

Mr. RAYBURN. To cover only those; yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would the gentleman have any objection to having that amendment reported?

Mr. RAYBURN. No; none at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let the amendment be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "other," in line 2, page 2, and strike out also the period after the word "person," in line 2, insert a comma, and add the following: "Within the permitted class, as specified in section 402 of said act, provided the person to be insured has been taken a prisoner of war before April 12, 1918: And provided further, That no one but the insured may designate a beneficiary, and nothing in this resolution shall be deemed to change or effect the permitted class of beneficiaries or impose any obligation on the insured against his will."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the present construction of the law, any person within the classes that may be designated as beneficiaries may take out the insurance for the soldier, provided it is subsequently approved by him.

Mr. RAYBURN. They may make application, but before the insurance can be issued the application must be approved by the insured.

Mr. STAFFORD. The purpose of this joint resolution is to take care of those who are prisoners of war and who can not approve the application.

Mr. RAYBURN. Who can neither make the application nor indorse it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the reading of the joint resolution, any person other than the insured may make this application. Does not the gentleman from Texas think that should be limited to the beneficiaries?

Mr. RAYBURN. I have limited it, and that is the reason for the amendment I propose to offer, so that only the people

in the permitted class of beneficiaries will be allowed to make this application.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No one except those in the permitted class.

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. This does not change in any respect the character of the beneficiary?

Mr. RAYBURN. Not at all.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. A case has recently been brought to my attention, in which a boy was taken from an orphan asylum and reared by a family, but the legal processes of adoption were not complied with. It is held, and doubtless properly, that the foster parents can not in such a case be beneficiaries. But it has occurred to me that there are cases of that sort which present very strong equities, and I want to ask the gentleman if his committee has given any thought to an amendment that would cover cases of that kind?

Mr. RAYBURN. We have, and I have been in communication with the department, and it is my intention within a few days to introduce a bill covering several minor details of that sort. It is our intention to try to provide by that bill that anybody who stands in the place of the parent shall be a beneficiary of this insurance, the same as the parents. That is one of the things we intend to cover in the bill that I propose to introduce.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In a case such as I have described the purpose of the committee is to make the bill broad enough to cover those who stand in the place of parents, whether the legal formalities of adoption have been gone through with or not?

Mr. RAYBURN. That is my intention.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to inquire whether under the present law the parents or next of kin can not make application for insurance in the place of the soldier?

Mr. RAYBURN. They can make application, but before the insurance can be issued upon it, it must have the indorsement of the soldier. These boys who are prisoners of war can not be reached, even to indorse the application.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understood that they could make the application, but I did not understand about the indorsement.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I did not quite understand the gentleman with reference to the change which may be under consideration with reference to the beneficiaries. Did I correctly understand the gentleman that the change contemplated would authorize the foster parents, for example, who had always cared for a boy who had become a soldier, to be made beneficiaries?

Mr. RAYBURN. It is my intention within a few days to introduce a bill that will be broad enough to cover cases of that kind.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think that would be highly commendable.

Mr. RAYBURN. The present law does not cover that, and neither does this bill.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have had cases called to my attention a number of times where foster parents had cared for the soldier ever since he was a small child, and yet they could get no benefits under the insurance law.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. If this amendment is adopted and insurance is taken out for a prisoner, who will pay for that?

Mr. RAYBURN. It does not say. The department would hold that under the law as it now stands they do not question where the money to cover the premium comes from. The amendment specifically reads that there shall be no obligation placed on the insured by reason of some one else taking out insurance; and, furthermore, if he is in a place where he can not name the beneficiary, the policy, as far as the beneficiary is concerned, is left blank, and when he gets where he can name him he may do so. In case he dies and no beneficiary is named, the insurance would go to the estate and be distributed according to laws of the State.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. The practical effect is that the beneficiaries themselves have to pay for it.

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes; somebody besides the soldier.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I will.

Mr. KEARNS. Under the law now in force the time for taking out insurance expires April 12. Under your bill is the time extended?

Mr. RAYBURN. It does not extend the time at all.

Mr. KEARNS. Suppose that some relative of the soldier who is taken prisoner should take out insurance to-morrow, or after the bill becomes a law, how does the Government know, or the person who took out the insurance know, that the soldier is still alive?

Mr. RAYBURN. That would have to be determined.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. COX. The regular order.

The SPEAKER. But the regular order is demanded. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Rayburn amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "other," in line 2, page 2, and strike out also the period after the word "person" in line 2 and insert a comma, and add the following: "within the permitted class as specified in section 402 of said act: *Provided*, That the person to be insured has been taken prisoner of war before April 12, 1918: *And provided further*, That no one but the insured may designate the beneficiary, and nothing in this resolution shall be deemed to change or affect the permitted class of beneficiaries or impose any obligation upon the insured against his will."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Rayburn amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GARNER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. Is not the gentleman from Texas in charge of the bill entitled to the floor?

The SPEAKER. He is.

Mr. GARNER. I do not want the gentleman from Minnesota to get the floor for an hour's debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is not going to get the floor for an hour's debate. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota five minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to me to ask the chairman a question? I would like to ask if he has considered whether the language now used will not interfere with the present provision of law which allows an application to be made by the next of kin subject to the approval of the insured?

Mr. RAYBURN. This language was written by the counsel for the bureau.

Mr. TOWNER. The language of the amendment is that nobody but the insurer shall be allowed to name the beneficiary. Now, if that be the case, would not that constitute an interference per se with the provisions of the law which allows an application to be made by the next of kin subject to the approval of the insured?

Mr. RAYBURN. Under the present law that does not change it; nobody has a right to name the beneficiary but the insured himself.

Mr. TOWNER. I understand that, but my question is—the law now permits the application to be made for insurance by the next of kin subject to the approval of the insured, the soldier. Now, will this language stating that he only can name the beneficiary constitute an interference with that provision of the law?

Mr. RAYBURN. I can not conceive how it would. It specifically states that it does not change the law except as to the party taking out the insurance.

Mr. TOWNER. That may take care of it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the gentleman will give me his attention I desire first to say that, listening as accurately as I could to the reading of the amendment twice by the Clerk, I do not quite see how it materially changes existing law. It may be that I did not hear it accurately. I do not see that it changes the existing order of things very much, but I will take the gentleman's word for it. If it does, we are all for it; and if it does not, no harm has been done.

I want to ask the gentleman in reference to an entirely different matter that I think should receive attention at the hands of his committee. The law providing for insurance makes the insurance available to those in the military and naval service of the United States, including nurses of the Red Cross in the hospital, units under control of the Medical Department, and certain other individuals.

At the outbreak of this war we sent to Russia a military organization consisting of officers who were commissioned but not in the Regular Establishment as we view the military forces and men who were to go as workers, and they are now in Russia under circumstances of grave peril. They went over there in furtherance of the interests of the United States to assist in the rebuilding of railways in Russia and in their operation. I have recently received a communication from quite a number of those men—they all united in signing it, and it was sent back and mailed from Japan—in which they say they have been notified by their insurance companies that their insurance is off, that their lives are not now insured, and they believe that they are engaged in military service of practically equal merit with those elsewhere engaged in military work for the United States, and they ask that they be included in this. I see no reason why they should not be.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I will state to the gentleman that that question has been discussed in our committee. It was brought up by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch], and we intend to cover such a case as that in the general overhauling of the bill.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, do all of the policies of all of the companies in the United States have a clause in them where if the insured move from one place to another they can be canceled?

Mr. RAYBURN. They do not all have that clause.

Mr. GARNER. I think I have a couple of policies that have not that clause in them.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman why the date April 12, 1918, is inserted?

Mr. RAYBURN. For the reason that we thought there ought to be a definite date. This is in the law now. We do not change the law as it is now written.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas whether anything has been done by the committee in regard to the rehabilitation of the wounded soldier—the question we had up when the bill was under consideration before?

Mr. RAYBURN. Nothing has yet been done. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RAYBURN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

INDUSTRIAL CREDITS.

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the third reading of the bill (S. 3714) to provide further for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to provide credits for industries and enterprises in the United States necessary or contributory to the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes. The Clerk will read the bill the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 370, nays 2, answered "present" 2, not voting 57, as follows:

YEAS—370.

Alexander	Beakes	Brodbeck	Caldwell
Almon	Bell	Browne	Campbell, Kans.
Anderson	Beshlin	Browning	Campbell, Pa.
Ashbrook	Black	Brumbaugh	Candler, Miss.
Austin	Bland	Buchanan	Cannon
Ayres	Blanton	Burnett	Cantrill
Bacharach	Booher	Burroughs	Caraway
Baer	Bowers	Butler	Carew
Bankhead	Brand	Byrnes, S. C.	Carlin
Barkley	Britten	Byrns, Tenn.	Carter, Okla.

Cary	Goodwin, Ark.	Lunn	Sears
Chandler, N. Y.	Gordon	McAndrews	Sells
Clark, Fla.	Gould	McArthur	Shackleford
Clark, Pa.	Graham, Ill.	McClintic	Shallenberger
Claason	Gray, Ala.	McCormick	Sherley
Claypool	Green, Iowa	McCulloch	Sherwood
Cleary	Greene, Mass.	McFadden	Shouse
Coady	Greene, Vt.	McKenzie	Siegel
Collier	Gregg	McKinley	Sims
Connally, Tex.	Griest	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinnott
Connelly, Kans.	Griffin	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sisson
Cooper, Ohio	Hadley	McLemore	Slayden
Cooper, W. Va.	Hamil	Madden	Slemp
Cooper, Wis.	Hamilton, Mich.	Magee	Sloan
Copley	Hamilton, N. Y.	Maher	Small
Costello	Hardy	Mansfield	Smith, Idaho
Cox	Harrison, Miss.	Mapes	Smith, Mich.
Crago	Harrison, Va.	Martin	Smith, C. B.
Cramton	Haskell	Merritt	Snell
Crisp	Hastings	Miller, Minn.	Snook
Crosser	Haugen	Miller, Wash.	Snyder
Dale, N. Y.	Hawley	Mondell	Stegall
Dale, Vt.	Hayden	Montague	Stedman
Dallinger	Heaton	Moon	Steele
Darrow	Heflin	Moore, Pa.	Steenerson
Davidson	Helm	Moore, Ind.	Stephens, Mich.
Decker	Helvering	Morgan	Stephens, Nebr.
Delaney	Hensley	Morfin	Sterling, Ill.
Denison	Hersey	Mott	Sterling, Pa.
Dent	Hicks	Mudd	Stevenson
Denton	Hillard	Neely	Stiness
Dewalt	Holland	Nelson	Strong
Dickinson	Hood	Nichols, Mich.	Sullivan
Dill	Houston	Nolan	Summers
Dillon	Howard	Norton	Sweet
Dixon	Huddleston	Oldfield	Swift
Dominick	Hull, Iowa	Oliver, Ala.	Tague
Dooling	Hull, Tenn.	Oliver, N. Y.	Taylor, Ark.
Doolittle	Humphreys	Osborne	Taylor, Colo.
Doughton	Husted	O'Shaunessy	Temple
Dowell	Hutchinson	Overstreet	Thomas
Draue	Igoe	Padgett	Thompson
Dunn	Ireland	Paige	Tillman
Dupré	Jacoway	Park	Tilson
Dyer	James	Peters	Tinberlake
Eagan	Johnson, Ky.	Phelan	Tinkham
Elliot	Johnson, Wash.	Platt	Towner
Ellsworth	Jones, Tex.	Polk	Treadway
Elston	Jones, Va.	Porter	Venable
Emerson	Juhl	Pou	Vestal
Esch	Kearns	Powers	Vinson
Estopinal	Keating	Price	Volgt
Evans	Kelley, Mich.	Purnell	Volstead
Fairfield	Kelly, Pa.	Quin	Waldow
Farr	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey	Walker
Ferris	Kennedy, R. I.	Raker	Walsh
Fess	Kettner	Ramsayer	Walton
Fields	Key, Ohio	Randall	Watkins
Fisher	Kless, Pa.	Rankin	Watson, Pa.
Flood	Kinchelee	Rayburn	Watson, Va.
Flynn	King	Reavis	Weaver
Focht	Kinkaid	Reed	Webb
Foster	Kitchin	Riordan	Welling
Francis	Knutson	Robbins	Welty
Frear	Kraus	Roberts	Whaley
Freeman	Krider	Robinson	Wheeler
French	Langley	Rodenberg	White, Me.
Fulker, Ill.	Larsen	Rogers	White, Ohio
Fulker, Mass.	Lazaro	Romjue	Williams
Gallagher	Lee, Cal.	Rose	Wilson, Ill.
Gallivan	Lee, Ga.	Rouse	Wilson, Tex.
Gandy	Leshner	Rowe	Wingo
Gard	Lever	Rubey	Winslow
Gariand	Linthicum	Rucker	Wise
Garner	Little	Russell	Wood, Ind.
Garrett, Tenn.	Littlepage	Sabath	Woods, Iowa
Garrett, Tex.	Lobeck	Sanders, La.	Woodyard
Gillett	London	Sanders, N. Y.	Wright
Glass	Loneragan	Sanford	Young, N. Dak.
Glynn	Longworth	Saunders, Va.	Young, Tex.
Godwin, N. C.	Lufkin	Scott, Iowa	Zihlman
Good	Lundeen	Scott, Mich.	
Goodall			

NAYS—2.

La Follette Mason
ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.
Hayes Stafford

NOT VOTING—57.

Anthony	Drukker	Lehibach	Schall
Aswell	Eagle	Lenroot	Scott, Pa.
Barnhart	Edmonds	McKeown	Scully
Blackmon	Fairchild, B. L.	Mann	Smith, T. F.
Borland	Fairchild, G. W.	Mays	Switzer
Carter, Mass.	Fordney	Meeker	Talbot
Chandler, Okla.	Foss	Nichols, S. C.	Templeton
Church	Graham, Pa.	Olney	Van Dyke
Currie, Mich.	Gray, N. J.	Overmyer	Vare
Curry, Cal.	Heintz	Parker, N. J.	Ward
Davis	Hollingsworth	Parker, N. Y.	Wason
Dempsey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Ragsdale	Wilson, La.
Dies	Kahn	Ramsey	
Donovan	Kehoe	Rowland	
Doremus	LaGuardia	Sanders, Ind.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana with Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma.
Mr. WALKER with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. FOSS.
Mr. KEHOE with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. PHELAN with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BROWNING.
Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
Mr. SCULLY with Mr. HAYES.
Mr. BARNHART with Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma.
Mr. BORLAND with Mr. DAVIS.
Mr. CHURCH with Mr. DEMPSEY.
Mr. DIES with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.
Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. LEHLBACH.
Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. FORDNEY.
Mr. McKEOWN with Mr. EDMONDS.
Mr. BLACKMON with Mr. KAHN.
Mr. NICHOLS of South Carolina with Mr. MEEKER.
Mr. EAGLE with Mr. PARKER of New Jersey.
Mr. MAYS with Mr. SWITZER.
Mr. OLNEY with Mr. RAMSEY.
Mr. SCHALL with Mr. PARKER of New York.
Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. TEMPLETON.
Mr. ASWELL with Mr. WARD.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye." I have a general pair with my colleague [Mr. TALBOTT]. If he were present he would vote "aye" also, and therefore I let my vote stand.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House bill 10608 will lie on the table.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. KITCHIN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the House insist on its amendment to the Senate bill and asks for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I make the motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia offers a motion in the nature of instructions to the conferees, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

I move that the managers on the part of the House be instructed to insist in conference on the retention of that part of the amendment embodied in section 13 of the House bill, on page 11, which is in these words:

"SEC. 13. That the Federal reserve banks shall be authorized, subject to the maturity limitations of the Federal reserve act and to regulations of the Federal Reserve Board, to discount the direct obligations of member banks secured by such bonds of the corporation and to rediscount eligible paper secured by such bonds and indorsed by a member bank. No discount or rediscount under this section shall be granted at a less interest charge than 1 per cent per annum above the prevailing rates for eligible commercial paper of corresponding maturity, nor, in any event, unless such member bank satisfies the Federal reserve bank that it has in its possession for the purposes of such transaction in-sufficient commercial paper eligible for discount or rediscount under the regulations of the Federal Reserve Board made under authority of the Federal reserve act."

Mr. KITCHIN. I hope the gentleman will not insist on that.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, when the bill just passed was first drawn to my attention it was quite obvious to me that it had been given a mistaken reference. The bill plainly was a banking and currency measure and should have been referred to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House. In this connection I want to say that the chairman and the members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House were perfectly courteous and reasonable about the suggestion that a rereference of the bill be had. They made no objection to it. I did not insist upon a rereference, notwithstanding the fact that some of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House were very anxious that there should be a reference of the bill. One reason why I did not insist upon a rereference was the very sane and fair attitude of the chairman and members of the Committee on Ways and Means. They asked the chairman and other members of the Committee on Banking and Currency to review the bill and offer suggestions, especially with reference to those provisions that brought the war-finance corporation in contact with the Federal Reserve System. Some of the amendments suggested in response to this invitation have been embodied in the bill. For instance, section 13, in my judgment, is the only thing that stands, textually, between the Federal Reserve System and utter wreck. It is the one literal safeguard which should not be abandoned or weakened. I do not believe the House or the country would desire to see the commercial banking credit system of the country impaired or menaced by the operations of an emergency system chiefly devised to refund the obligations and finance the business of public-

service corporations, railroads, war-supply enterprises, and great concerns that relate themselves to the conduct of the war. This scheme was presented by those who designed it as an emergency measure. This particular provision of the bill—I mean section 13—makes it an emergency measure. The Senate bill, as it came to the House, in a kindred provision practically made the bonds of the war-finance corporation preferential security for discounts and rediscounts at Federal reserve banks and in the open-market transactions of these banks. The Senate provision practically issued an engraved invitation to the great concerns of the country that are in need of refunding facilities to come and get priority benefits of the Federal Reserve System, largely to the exclusion of current commerce and industry. That provision of the Senate bill, together with its open-market feature, if enacted into law, might and very likely would clutter up the Federal reserve banks with unliquid securities, and to that extent impair, if not exhaust, their ability to minister readily to current commerce and industry.

Those features of the Senate bill would, in my judgment, very greatly endanger our entire commercial banking system which, in any event, must endure a great strain. I was induced to support this bill because of the very reasonable and sane attitude of the Committee on Ways and Means, reflected in its willingness to make amendments that have largely cured its defects. By no means the least important of these amendments are those especially designed to safeguard the commercial banking system of the United States.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. GLASS. I do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In view of that statement of the gentleman's confidence in the Committee on Ways and Means, does the gentleman think it wise to adopt this rather unusual matter of instructing the conferees in advance?

Mr. GLASS. The vital importance of this matter, the crucial nature of the question in issue, prompted me, with great reluctance, to offer this instruction. Ordinarily I do not believe in instructions, although I remind the gentleman that the Banking and Currency Committee has several times been instructed by the House on problems of vastly less consequence than the one I am now discussing. I have so often seen bills go into conference and brought back here in such a radically altered shape that I am fearful for this particular item. Gentlemen, if this House provision, this section 13, does not remain in this bill the Congress will have done a grave injury to the commercial interests of the country. It will have invited disaster.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. I do.

Mr. MONDELL. I have great confidence in the gentleman from Virginia and in his knowledge of these matters and shall be inclined to follow him. It occurred to me, however, that I suggest to the gentleman that, in the first place, this is a rather unusual feature that might be resented, and in addition, while it is tremendously important, and I am willing to take the judgment of the gentleman from Virginia that it is perhaps the most important provision in the bill, there are other very important provisions in the bill differing widely from the bill as it passed the Senate.

Might not this situation arise? In emphasizing the insistence of the House upon this vital and important matter, might it not leave the inference that we were not so insistent on other very important matters?

Mr. GLASS. I realize the force of what the gentleman has said. That very thought occurred to me; but I have reason to imagine that a very direct "drive" will be made at this particular section of the bill, because there was at the outset very strenuous objection by the proponents of this measure to the incorporation of this provision in the bill. And while I am as averse as anybody possibly could be to inviting resentments, I would rather incur the resentment of those who would strike this section out of the bill than to feel the righteous resentment to which the country will doubtless give expression unless this provision shall remain in the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. I would like to interrupt the gentleman a minute.

I practically agree with the gentleman that the substance of section 13 should be a part of this bill when it becomes a law; that it is essential for the protection of the Federal Reserve System; and the gentleman from Virginia fully knows my views on this section and on the relation that this bill should bear to the Federal reserve act. I trust he will withdraw his motion. I believe that I know the sentiment of the House with regard to that section as well as the gentleman's feelings about it and the feelings of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee, and I know that I know the feelings of

each one of the members of the Ways and Means Committee. Therefore I can assure him that the managers on the part of the House would take care to preserve the Federal Reserve System in its integrity, and whatever we do with that section is not going to hurt the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. GLASS. I will.

Mr. GILLETT. Would not the gentleman from North Carolina assure the House, as is often done by gentlemen having charge of a bill, that this section shall not be yielded in conference until the House has had an opportunity to express itself upon it?

Mr. GLASS. I was just about to ask the gentleman from North Carolina if he would not be willing to give the House that assurance.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, of course, if it shall not be touched in any particular, there would be no conference on that section, and of course we would have to report a disagreement. But I can—

Mr. GILLETT. On the vital particulars?

Mr. KITCHIN. I can give this assurance to the House that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and other gentlemen who desire to instruct us, will be satisfied before we come back with it.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. GLASS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MONDELL. This is a very important bill, and it is a bill with regard to which the sentiment of the House is very largely a unit, I think. It is quite different from the measure passed in the other body, not only with regard to this exceedingly important section but in regard to other sections. I assume that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and his conferees would not agree either to a vital modification of this section or of other vital sections without giving the House an opportunity to express its opinion.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think the gentleman can—

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] a question?

Mr. GLASS. You may.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that, where a motion like the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia has been offered and agreed to by the House and sent over to the Senate with the bill itself, the Senate has refused to have a conference until that was modified?

Mr. GLASS. I had occasion to look that up some time ago, when the House was wise enough to instruct the Banking and Currency Committee in a certain matter, and I found only one instance in which the Senate long ago declined a conference in circumstances of that sort.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I remember it was brought up here on the floor, but I do not recall when, and that precedent was, I think, the one that was cited, and the contention was that if the Senate should send over here a bill with its conferees already instructed not to consent to anything except what the Senate has already adopted, you might as well not have a conference.

Mr. GLASS. That is usually stated when a proposition like this is up.

Mr. KITCHIN. Let me say that I think with the assurances I have given the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], the gentleman from Virginia could well withdraw his motion with respect to the section.

Mr. MONDELL. I understand the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] to say that neither this section nor other sections will be greatly amended.

Mr. KITCHIN. I said with regard to this section, which is so vitally important to the preservation of the Federal Reserve System in its integrity, that I would not come to an agreement in conference until gentlemen who had made these objections—that is, who seemed to favor this instruction—were satisfied with the action that the House conferees would take on it.

Mr. GLASS. With that statement, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to withdraw the motion.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. HAYES. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I just desire to say that I fully agree with the statement in all respects made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I think this provision as it appears in the bill is one of the best, if not the best, amendment of all the amendments that the Ways and Means Committee put on it.

I think the provision could well be strengthened, but I should hate to see it modified in any way so that it would weaken it.

Mr. GLASS. Well, that is precisely my position, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLASS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. McFADDEN. I wanted to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the past when conferees have been instructed to maintain "the substance," or, in this instance, "assurances to that effect," the conferees have exceeded that authority; that the insertion of the word "substance" gives the conferees great latitude; and that almost the same condition that is presented here was presented when we last instructed the conferees on the Federal reserve act, in connection with the collection-charges provision amendments, with which the gentleman is familiar, because he was one of the conferees who, I contend, violated that very instruction given by this House to maintain a certain amendment to the bill—

Mr. GLASS. I will say to my colleague that I was wiser than he, and did not use the broad language which he unhappily used in the case cited. The House had an opportunity to pass on the dispute, and did not agree that the conferees disobeyed instructions. In this motion I have not asked for the retention of the "substance" of section 13, but its text.

Mr. McFADDEN. I was simply calling the gentleman's attention to the fact that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] used the word "substance" this morning when he said that the "substance" would be maintained, so as to not injure the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. Speaker, I feel confident that I can rely on the assurance given by the gentleman from North Carolina. I wanted that assurance. I am glad the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] anticipated me in asking it; and, having received it, I withdraw the motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the motion, and that is the end of it. The Clerk will announce the conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KITCHEN, Mr. RAINEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GREEN of Iowa.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. OVERMYER, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for one week, on account of important business.

INCREASED COMPENSATION TO EMPLOYEES, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I send up House resolution 290 (H. Rept. No. 397).

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 9414, entitled "A bill granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes"; that there shall be not to exceed three hours of general debate, to be divided between those supporting and those opposing the bill. At the conclusion of such general debate the bill shall be considered for amendments under the five-minute rule, and during such consideration it shall be in order, the general rules of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to offer and consider as additional sections the following:

"I.

"That to promote the conservation of food products and to facilitate the collection and delivery thereof from producer to consumer, and the delivery of articles necessary in the production of such food products to the producers, the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to conduct experiments in the operation of motor-vehicle truck routes in the vicinity of such cities of the United States as he may select, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and the cost of such experiments, not exceeding \$300,000, may be paid by the Postmaster General out of any unexpended appropriations of the Postal Service, and the Postmaster General shall report the result of such experiments to the Congress at the earliest practicable date.

"Sec. —. That the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, deliver and turn over to the Postmaster General from time to time, and without charge therefor, for use in the Postal Service, such aeroplanes and automobiles or parts thereof as may prove to be, or as shall become, unsuitable for the purposes of the War Department; and the Postmaster General is hereby authorized to use the same, in his discretion, in the transportation of the mails and to pay the necessary expenses thereof out of the appropriation for inland transportation by steamboat or other power boat or by aeroplanes or star route.

"Sec. —. That from and after the passage of this act the Postmaster General, in his discretion, may require the payment of postage on mail carried by aeroplane at not exceeding 24 cents per ounce or fraction thereof."

"II.

"Sec. —. That hereafter the balance to the credit of any one person in a postal-savings depository, exclusive of accumulated interest, shall not exceed \$3,000. Noninterest-paying deposits shall not be accepted. All laws inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

"Sec. —. That section 6 of the act approved June 25, 1910, is hereby further amended so that the proviso in said section shall read as follows: 'Provided, That in order that smaller amounts may be accumulated for deposit, any person may purchase for 10 cents, from any postal savings depository, specially prepared adhesive stamps to be known as "postal savings stamps," and attach them to a card which

shall be furnished for the purpose. A card with 10 postal savings stamps affixed shall be accepted as a deposit of \$1 either in opening an account or in adding to an existing account, or may be redeemed in cash.'

"Sec. —. The additional compensation granted by the provisions of this bill shall be paid out of the revenues of the Post Office Department. If the revenues of the said department shall be insufficient to meet the appropriations made by this act, a sum equal to such deficiency of the revenue of said department is hereby appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply said deficiencies in the revenues for the Post Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1919, and the sum needed may be advanced to the Post Office Department upon requisition of the Postmaster General."

After the bill shall have been perfected in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, the same shall be reported to the House, with such recommendation as the committee may make, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill and all amendments thereto for final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In a moment. Can I arrange with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] upon some time?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I think 20 minutes on a side will be satisfactory.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] for 20 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, if I may have two or three minutes without interruption, I think I can explain this rule, which upon its face may seem to be somewhat complicated, but which really is not very complicated.

The purpose of the rule is to make in order for consideration the bill H. R. 9414, granting increase of compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and in the Postal Service, and for other purposes. It is commonly referred to as the Moon-Madden postal bill. It provides for an increase in pay to postal clerks, and so forth.

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads this morning indicated to the Committee on Rules its desire that there should be made in order for consideration two other bills that have been favorably acted upon by that committee, to wit, Senate bill 2718, with certain amendments that the House committee had agreed upon, and H. R. 8637, with certain amendments that the House committee had agreed upon; and so the Committee on Rules, being agreeable to making these in order for consideration, determined that the simplest way to bring them before the House would be to quote the language of those bills in the rule itself, and that has been done. If gentlemen will obtain copies of Senate bill 2718 and House bill 8637 they will see the bills which the committee has reported in this resolution outside of H. R. 9414.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee this question: That, having originally provided in the rule that there should be three hours' debate on the Moon-Madden bill, does he think it would be exactly fair to bring in two other very important measures in this rule without increasing the time for debate?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Committee on Rules considered that, and the committee thought that three hours for general debate would still be sufficient, assuming that, of course, there would be liberal debate granted under the five-minute rule upon these propositions.

Mr. WALSH. But the Committee on Rules provided for three hours' debate originally upon the Moon-Madden bill, so called.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It did.

Mr. WALSH. And these two other bills which have been tacked on to the rule which the gentleman has offered are very important measures, and if taken up in the ordinary course would undoubtedly consume more than three hours.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will say to my friend that that was discussed in the committee. I think I violate no confidence in saying that there was some suggestion that the debate be cut to two hours on the whole proposition. Finally it was decided that there should be three hours.

Now, if there is any other gentleman who wants to ask me a question on the rule itself, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. NORTON and Mr. BURNETT rose.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield first to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Tennessee if the gentleman thought that bringing in a rule of this kind, containing these two additional bills, was really fair

to the House? It occurred to me that the rule should have been printed. The bills that the gentleman has mentioned have been pending for some time, but I have not been able to secure copies of them, and at the desk no provision has been made for Members to secure copies.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In answer to that I will say it has been understood for many days that this resolution as to increasing compensation of postal employees would follow immediately after the conclusion of the war finance corporation bill. Word reached the committee late yesterday afternoon, and not all the members of the committee then, that consideration was also desired of these other bills at this time. There was not time to have it printed unless we had disarranged the whole program.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. BURNETT. As I understand from the reading of the rule, it is not the purpose of the committee, nor does the rule, as I understand it, operate as a limitation on the offering of other amendments that are germane?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Not at all.

Mr. BURNETT. It makes these amendments germane without cutting off the right of Members to offer other amendments that are germane?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. No. It merely makes them in order.

Mr. STEENERSON. Was it not the understanding of the Committee on Rules that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads had requested this kind of a rule? The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads had a meeting and authorized the chairman to request a rule on the salary bill—on the original salary bill; but, as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, I never heard that the chairman of the committee was authorized to ask for a rule on the other bills, and what I want to know is whether the Committee on Rules so understood it?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Committee on Rules understood that these measures had been reported favorably from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. The chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads came before the Committee on Rules and suggested that they be made in order on this proposition. Whether he did it by direction of the committee or upon his responsibility as chairman I do not know.

Mr. STEENERSON. It must have been on his own motion, because the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads authorized the chairman to ask for a rule on the salary bill.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Had the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads acted favorably upon these two other bills?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not know. I doubt it. I made a minority report on that truck proposition; that is, if it is the same bill. I can not tell whether it is or not, from what I could hear of the reading of it.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield a moment?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MOON. In the first place, the rule was offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who, as a Member of the House, had a right to go before the Committee on Rules and make the request for its consideration. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads then formally directed the chairman of that committee to make the request. The chairman did not see fit to change the resolution of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. So he went before the committee with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and requested the rule on the original bill—House bill 9414. Then the chairman, as he had the right, asked the committee on his own initiative—after having talked with a number of the members of his committee—and requested that these two measures mentioned, with reference to motor trucks and the postal-savings bank, be also added for consideration at this time, because the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads had acted favorably on both of those measures, and they had been favorably reported to the House. Now, it is a saving of time and a much more sensible proposition to consider all this legislation at one time than to have three separate measures up for consideration.

Mr. STEENERSON. I simply want it understood that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads had not acted on the question of consolidating these three bills into one, as this rule does.

Mr. MOON. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads have given no consideration at any meeting of the committee to the question of consolidating these bills.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I wish to say that independent of that the view of the Committee on Rules is that if these propositions are to be considered—and we understand that undoubt-

edly there would be pressure for their consideration—it is better to consider them now, and it is a saving of time to consider them now.

Now, how much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 11 minutes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. A question about the rule?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Do I understand that all the provisions of the rule were placed in the rule at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, or were some of them placed in the rule on the initiative of the Rules Committee?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. None were placed in the rule on the initiative of the Rules Committee. All that the Rules Committee have reported is that which the committee understood the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads had previously reported favorably.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. EMERSON. Does the rule provide the order in which the bill and these other propositions shall be considered? I can not get a copy of the rule to read it.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The salary increase bill will be considered first. These other bills will come in as sections at the end of that bill.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing unusual or revolutionary about this rule. In the first place, it makes in order the bill for increase of pay for those employed in the Postal Service as distinguished from the postal clerks. The bill will give the House an opportunity to consider the increase of the pay of rural carriers and railway mail clerks and others known as employees in the Postal Service. This, of course, should be done.

This morning the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads notified the Committee on Rules that two important measures had been under consideration by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, one of them a Senate bill and one of them a House bill, and asked the Committee on Rules to permit the House to consider those bills as amendments to the bill for which the original rule had been asked; and in direct answer to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON], who wanted to know which of these bills would be considered first, I will say that the bill to be considered is the bill for the increase of the pay of the postal employees. These other bills are to be offered as amendments to that bill under the five-minute rule. They are made in order by this rule. Otherwise they would be ruled out on a point of order, not being germane to the bill. This rule simply makes them in order as amendments to the bill increasing the salaries or pay of the postal employees. That is all the rule does. It simplifies the business of the House.

I sincerely hope that the rule will be agreed to, and that the bill increasing the pay of the postal employees will be passed. It is for the House to consider these amendments. They are simply made in order, that is all. The House can reject them or vote them in as it sees fit.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. It is quite evident that so far as the Madden-Moon bill, increasing the compensation of rural carriers and mail clerks is concerned, there is a universal demand for that bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Now, it is proposed to attach these other bills as riders to that bill?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Not as riders. They will be in order as amendments. The House can accept or reject them, as it sees fit.

Mr. ROBBINS. But would we not be compelled to accept the other two in order to get the first bill through?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Not at all.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. There will be a separate vote on each amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The Members of the House can vote down these amendments if they see fit. If a majority of the House is in favor of them, I take it they will be attached to the bill. If a majority of the House is against them, they will undoubtedly be defeated.

Mr. ROBBINS. There will be ample opportunity to consider these measures?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; undoubtedly. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May I ask the gentleman from Kansas, can he let me have 5 minutes of his time? I have 15 minutes promised on this side.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. SNELL. I will be glad if the gentleman will let the gentleman from Tennessee have five minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee and the remainder of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, of course, as originally intended, this resolution was to cover only House bill 9414, which simply provided for an increase in the compensation of certain officials and employees of the Post Office Department; but, as I understood, and as the committee understood from the chairman of the Post Office Committee, this other matter had been favorably reported by the committee, and they desired to have it considered at this time; and the rule, as I understand it, simply makes it in order to consider these other things as amendments, and it is simply before the House to take such action as it sees fit and can adopt or reject any or all of it.

Last year, when the House increased the compensation of various employees of the Government, it was intended to increase the compensation of the employees of the Postal Department the same as in other departments.

But on account of a technical ruling by the Treasury Department certain employees of the Post Office Department did not receive the increase. Therefore, these men have been going along this past year trying to meet increased living expense without the increase in pay that various other employees of other departments have received. And it has been not only manifestly unfair to them but absolutely detrimental to the Postal Service, on account of the number of resignations from the service, on account of our failure to give them the much-needed increase that would enable them to meet the increased cost of living in all parts of the country. Our people are accustomed to high efficiency in the Post Office Department, and the efficiency depends entirely upon the men of experience and older in the service, and these men are leaving the service at an alarming rate on account of the failure to act on this salary increase and better opportunities offered in other lines of work at the present time. I am informed that one-third of the employees of the Washington post office have resigned during the last year in order to take advantage of better opportunities offered in other departments of the Government service. And there are a great many others in all parts of the country that will soon do this unless we act on the salary question at an early date and give them the increase that the character of their work so richly deserves. And for the sake of right and justice to the individual employee and continued high efficiency in the Postal Service, I ask for immediate consideration and adjustment of these salary questions. Every one here well knows that the whole country is interested in this legislation. There are no other Government employees that come in so close touch with the people in city, village, and town as the members of the Post Office Department. There are no other employees in whose condition the people everywhere are so vitally interested, and I think I can truthfully say there are no employees, who year after year, winter and summer, hot or cold, wet or dry, continuously render such honest, conscientious, and courteous service as the employees of the Post Office Department.

The Post Office Committee has given very careful consideration to the question and voluminous hearings on the subject of salaries. There appeared before it representatives of every department of the service from all over the country. In addition 132 individual Members of Congress have appeared before the committee and requested this increase in pay for the postal employees and the early consideration by the House.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Has the Post Office Committee held voluminous hearings and filed a voluminous report on the other two measures that have been tacked on by the rule?

Mr. SNELL. It was originally intended to bring in only a rule making increase in salaries of this department in order, but at the request of the chairman of the Post Office Committee the other matters referred to were added to the rule this morning, and I can not inform you as to the hearings on the same.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman understand that the Post Office Committee is unanimous on the other two propositions?

Mr. SNELL. I understood it was a unanimous report.

Mr. WALSH. One is a Senate bill.

Mr. SNELL. I so understand, and that it has been approved by the Senate.

The provision of the bill I am specially interested in is that part which provides for the increased compensation to be paid to the employees of the Postal Service, and the provision in the bill which makes it effective immediately upon its passage. Therefore, I believe it is only fair to the employees of this department that this rule and bill should be acted upon at once, and also that it tends toward increased efficiency of the whole service that this rule should be adopted and the matter receive the immediate consideration by Members of this House.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I will.

Mr. EMERSON. I have been listening for some reason why the other two bills were tacked on to the original Madden bill.

Mr. SNELL. It was at the request of the chairman of the Post Office Committee, who thought it was important legislation and it would not take any more time to consider it now than some time later, and for that reason it was reported by the Rules Committee. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on this side?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. SNELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Would it be agreeable to the gentleman if I should yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY]?

Mr. NORTON. It would.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this rule, if adopted, will give an opportunity for the consideration of a measure that should have been passed months ago. On the first day of this session I introduced a measure providing for a 25 per cent increase for all postal employees in order that these faithful public servants might receive compensation which would in some degree enable them to meet the situation caused by the skyrocketing prices of the necessities of life.

When the Post Office appropriation bill was under consideration I urged immediate action. Since this bill was reported by the committee I have gladly exerted myself to secure the favorable action of the Rules Committee. Now, this rule and the measure are under consideration, and both should be passed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, it is a far cry from the beginning of postal service in this country to the present, when the United States Postal System excels any service in the world, its work every day a miracle of achievement. The history of that progress is a record of faithful work and arduous efforts on the part of those employed in the Postal Service.

Still the claims of those who have made the success of the United States system have been neglected. There has been but one increase in their pay in the last 40 years and that was 10 years ago. I maintain that a living wage in 1907 can not be made to cover the cost of living in 1917. The men in the Postal Service have been attempting an impossible task. It is unjust to force them longer to endure such a condition.

I have heard men talk about the necessity of a surplus in the Post Office Department. I submit that the Post Office Department was never intended as a money-making institution. It was established to give efficient postal service. You might as well ask how much money our public-school system is making or what dividends are paid by the fire departments. You can not translate such service into dollars and cents.

In 1885 Congress reduced postage rates when there was a deficit in the department. Newspapers were rated at a cent a pound and in some cases sent free. Franked matter from Government offices was sent out by the ton free of charge. Rural free delivery was established when it was known to all that it would not pay expenses. There was a reason for all this. It was to make the Postal Service a profit-sharing association for the benefit of all the people. Its dividends were to be paid in a more intelligent, enlightened citizenship.

Any talk of a surplus means nothing. The Postmaster General states in his report that there was a surplus of \$9,000,000 last year. But First Assistant Postmaster General Koons, in the hearings before the Post Office Committee of this House stated that there was a loss of \$72,000,000 on second-class matter; that franked matter would have cost \$20,000,000; and that the rural free delivery routes ran behind about \$36,000,000.

Figuring these together you have a total which is as correctly the yearly surplus of the Post Office Department as any other figure that can be given. It equals as much as the entire Post

Office equipment of the United States, post-office buildings, sites, and equipment.

In other words, there is 100 per cent dividend. No man can justly contend that no increase should be granted postal workers because it would result in a deficit. The first requirement is efficient service, and that can only be obtained through postal employees who are fairly paid and fairly treated.

The present rate of compensation of postal employees has resulted in enforced resignations at an alarming scale. Here is what the postmaster at Pittsburgh, Pa., writes me in urging the passage of this measure:

The situation in this office at the present time is such as to make it almost hopeless for the Postal Service to keep its full quota of clerks and carriers. During the past year many of the higher-salaried clerks and carriers resigned, owing to the fact that they could secure much higher wages outside the service.

This condition is in evidence in almost every post office in the country, and in the Railway Mail Service as well. At the Pittsburgh terminal railway post office, from June 1, 1917, to February 15, 1918, 627 railway post-office clerks left the service or refused to accept appointments; 59 joined the Army; so that 569 left the service from all other causes. The reason is not hard to find. Substitute railway mail clerks are paid \$2.22 a day when they work. The porters around the railroad station, some of whom can not even read or write, are paid \$3.40 a day. Such a humiliating situation should not exist for a single day.

Mr. Speaker, the employees of Uncle Sam are entitled to at least a living wage. The postal employees have not been receiving it. The fact is that their salaries have been cut in two by the mounting cost of living.

I hold in my hand the report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which states that the cost of food has increased 31 per cent in the past year alone. In the past 10 years the price of almost every necessary of life has doubled, and still not one cent has been added to the compensation of postal employees. Increases have been made by private employers. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that increases from 38 to 58 per cent have been made in some industries, but the United States Government has lagged behind instead of being in the lead. This bill gives an opportunity to help remedy this intolerable situation.

The reclassification sections of this bill will be most beneficial. It is not generally known that the letter carrier usually puts in nine years of service before he reaches the present maximum of \$1,200. That means an average salary of \$742 a year. At the same time he is required to perform duties which require brains, ability, and determination. This bill raises the lowest rate to \$1,000 and the maximum to \$1,500. It will be a worthy step toward fair treatment of faithful employees and increased efficiency.

The measure itself should be amended so that it be made permanent law, and not a temporary measure. There is no just reason for making it apply only to the war period. Then, too, it should provide expressly for the employees who are to receive the higher rates under the new classification. Let us make this a real measure of justice and of permanent benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I number some of my oldest and best friends among the postal employees. I know them and their conditions and their fidelity to duty. They work harder and receive less money in proportion than any other class of Government employees; but they are loyal and faithful, and their efforts to secure additional compensation have been modest, seemly, and worthy of all commendation.

I have here a letter addressed to me by Benjamin F. Metz, president of the Pittsburgh Branch, National Association of Letter Carriers. In it he says:

I have just noted in the newspaper that the Rules Committee, of which you are a member, has favorably reported a special rule for the consideration of the postal salary-increase measure. To-night, as I write this letter, the heart of every postal employee feels lighter, for he knows that at last this measure is to be given due consideration and that justice will be done these faithful employees. I want to extend to you the earnest thanks of every postal worker. Five years ago—in 1913—you helped splendidly in defeating a provision which would have endangered the Sunday-closing act. Time and again since then you have been our staunch friend and at the same time have fought the battles of the workers of all classes and conditions. You have well earned the gratitude of every believer in justice and a square deal, and the association which I represent extends thanks in full measure.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am glad to stand here and urge support of this measure. It is just recognition of worthy service. It is the square deal translated into action. It will put new heart into a host of hard-working, efficient employees. It will show that this Republic is not ungrateful to its own faithful servants. It will add to postal efficiency and make the Postal Service of greater usefulness than ever before in this critical period of American history. It will be an act worthy of this House of Representatives, and I hope it will pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, if this rule in the manner in which it has been brought in can be justified, then any rule and any hodgepodge method of legislation can be justified. Personally I have no objection to the Madden bill. I am in favor of the Madden bill. As far as I know I am in favor of the other two bills, but the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] attempts to justify a rule that brings unexpectedly on the floor of this House legislation that is not at all germane to the legislation that Members were given to understand the House would consider here to-day.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. In just a minute. Why not bring in a bill here, under a rule throwing it open to all character and kinds of legislation, if, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] suggests, such procedure would be justified on the ground that it would "expedite" legislation? The reason that the House has had almost since it was first organized among its rules of procedure the rule that amendments which are not germane to the principal legislation brought before the House shall not be in order is to protect and safeguard the public from carelessly considered legislation as well as from undesirable and dangerous legislation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is the gentleman interested in a bill which has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture authorizing the purchase of seed wheat?

Mr. NORTON. I am very much interested in it. I have wanted that it be enacted long before this time. Let me ask the gentleman why he did not bring that bill in here under this rule as could have been done?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I want to suggest to the gentleman that he better let us get along and get to that bill quickly.

Mr. NORTON. Why was not that bill made in order under the rule?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Because it had no relation to the Postal Service at all. There is a rule which has been reported to consider that bill, and if the gentleman will let us get to it, we will get to it quickly.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman could just as properly have brought in that bill under this rule as to make in order the bill to authorize experiments in motor-truck and aeroplane delivery of mail.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman says he is in favor of the Madden bill?

Mr. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. MOON. He is opposed, I take it, to the balance of the bill?

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman has no right to suppose that at all. His supposition can only be founded on his imagination and is not correct.

Mr. MOON. What part of this bill does the gentleman call the Madden bill?

Mr. NORTON. I call the bill H. R. 9414 the Madden bill.

Mr. MOON. That is the committee bill. The Madden bill has never been reported to this House.

Mr. NORTON. That is substantially what is frequently spoken of as the Madden bill.

Mr. MOON. No; it is not in substance the Madden bill. There is just one section of the Madden bill on this bill.

Mr. NORTON. Then I will say to the gentleman that I am in favor of the committee bill, H. R. 9414, the bill that it has been generally understood by the membership of this House was to be considered here to-day. I am opposed to this rule because the bringing in of a rule of this kind is a dangerous method of legislative procedure. If that procedure is to be followed in the House, while you may not get any bad legislation in this particular case, it will inevitably result in saddling onto the country legislation jokers—very undesirable legislation; legislation of a kind and character that would not receive favorable consideration in the House if proper and regular legislative procedure in the House were adhered to. I believe that if we are to maintain any order of legislation in this House this rule should be voted down. If these bills that have been suddenly tacked on here are to be considered by the House, they should be brought before the House under the regular and safe procedure of the House, and all Members of the House should have full and fair notice of their consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORRIS] takes a very peculiar attitude touching this rule. He says that he is for the Madden bill, but he is against the rule. This rule is the only way in which the Madden bill can be considered, and it is certainly not without precedent in this House.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. NORTON. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that it is necessary, to consider the Madden bill, to bring in a rule here placing in order two bills not germane to the Madden bill?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Oh, I once heard a story of a dog running after a rabbit. After the dog had pursued the rabbit over hill and dale, through wood and field, and finally tired to exhaustion, the rabbit fell a prey to its pursuer. The dog, first, bit the rabbit, then licked the rabbit, and finally the rabbit said, "If you are a friend, why bite me? If a foe, why caress me."

Now, if the gentleman is a friend of the employees in the Postal Service of this country he can not be against this rule. Let me cite the gentleman to an occasion here some three years ago, when we brought in a rule for the Agricultural appropriation bill that made in order the standardization of grain, the cotton-warehouse bill, and the cotton-futures act. And, if I recollect correctly, the gentleman made a speech for that rule and voted for it. We did not understand there was any opposition on the part of the gentleman then. Those matters were not germane to the then pending question any more than is this aeroplane experimental transportation or the motor-truck experimental proposition to the main question. But both are very necessary legislation and can very appropriately be considered at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that the postal employees of this country in the first and second class post offices should be reclassified and be allowed an increase of pay. No opposition can possibly arise to the slight increase provided for the fourth-class postmasters. Last year we gave an increase in pay to practically all employees in the District of Columbia, but the postal employees did not get an increase, notwithstanding the fact that the living cost has very materially increased. Why, I understand that the rural carriers are resigning at the rate of 50 per cent more than they were during normal times; that last year 6,000 rural carriers in the United States resigned their positions because they were not remunerative. That is a bad condition and we ought to remedy it. These men perform a great service; they do it at times under very adverse conditions, fighting storms, bad roads, and hundreds of other inconveniences. The upkeep of their teams or machines and the general increase in cost of living is so great that certainly we should give these employees a reasonable increase. The adoption of this rule is the only way to do it.

Mr. Speaker, the aeroplane has come to stay. In a few years immediately following the war these aeroplanes and the men in that service will be utilized in carrying the mail from city to city. It is well that at this time we begin an experimental service, so that the system in time can be perfected. Why, I can not believe the gentleman from North Dakota would object to the provision in the bill that will permit the farmers of North Dakota to load their dairy and farm products on motor trucks at their front gates and carry them into the city, there to be sold. I have always thought the gentleman was a friend of the farmers of his section, but certainly if he opposes that provision in the bill—and that seems to be the one that he is driving at—he is doing the farmers of his section a very great injustice. [Applause.]

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman knows he is making an unfair argument.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I think it is right along the line the gentleman has pointed out.

Mr. NORTON. The gentleman knows he is not making a fair argument, and he knows that I never said anything in opposition to the merit of the three measures mentioned.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Here is what I understood the gentleman to say. Let us see if I am correct. The gentleman is criticizing the Rules Committee because they are tacking on two other propositions to the Madden bill. One of those propositions is to try out an experimental motor system, so that the farmers of North Dakota and elsewhere can carry their dairy products and their farm products to market. The other provides for an experimental aviation service. Now, the gentleman is opposing these provisions. He says he would have no criticism of the Rules Committee if they had brought in a rule

merely to make in order the Madden bill. Do I misunderstand the gentleman?

Mr. NORTON. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. NORTON. My argument was that when a rule is brought in and it is announced to 435 Members of this House that a certain bill is to be considered, and Members who are here and Members who are not understand that, that it is not a proper procedure to bring in two other bills under that rule.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. We are providing the means to do the farmers some good in this country, as well as giving to a class of governmental employees a very deserved increase in their pay. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I fully appreciate the additional drain upon the Treasury this measure entails. I am also cognizant of the stupendous claims this war era demands and the uneasiness created in the minds of the public how we are to meet all the obligations. I agree that it is a time of all times when individual and Government must economize and conserve, as well as exercise the maximum energy in production. These considerations might lead to a conclusion that at this time there should not be an attempt to reclassify the Postal Service. I know opponents of this measure can make strong representations along this line.

But, Mr. Speaker, in this case, as in all others, real economy is not measured by size of the pay roll. If it was, then the smaller it is the greater the economy. The thing demanded in all Government service is the highest degree in efficient results. The Government will always stand ready to pay for service and pay a figure commensurate with the demands entailed. The Postal Service is the one great institution that brings the citizen and Government face to face. Every time a citizen enters the Federal building he is within the shelter of Uncle Sam; he faces one of Uncle Sam's live representatives; he transacts his business with his Government. He may not be fully aware of the stupendous operations of the lines of communications between citizen and citizen, whether living in the same city or county or whether in the remotest parts of the back country and, it may be, of the world. He certainly does not realize the most rigid responsibilities, under the severest penalties, the most exacting regulations as to character of service, hours of service, and details demanding a degree of ability above the average and a type of character suited to dealing with the public that is able to insure decent and cordial treatment in spite of the daily provocation to display the opposite, due to fickle public in its unreasonable demands. This service demands gentlemanly conduct, no matter what the provocation may be. This entails a higher than the average ability. The rate of pay in the Postal Service is too low. This bill promises a rating more commensurate with the importance of the country's work, more in keeping with the demands of efficient public service, and more adapted to the character of ability required to insure public satisfaction. I shall vote for it in the belief that the real economy the Nation demands is that which will insure the greatest efficiency and will place the Nation's public service on a plane where the maximum effort will be assured. I shall hope to see steps taken to insure relief in other channels in these days of high cost of living, such especially as will grant relief to the few surviving Union soldiers still among us.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have only one more speech.

Mr. SNELL. I have one more.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does the gentleman desire me to proceed now?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Candler].

Mr. Candler of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this rule is liberal and absolutely fair. It simply provides for giving the House of Representatives an opportunity to consider certain measures which it specifically points out. One of them is the bill H. R. 9414; the others are the two bills which have been mentioned, to wit, Senate bill 2718 and House bill 8637, both of which have been reported to the House by the Post Office Committee. It does not cut off any right of amendment of any kind or description, but it gives the House an opportunity to promptly take them up for consideration, with full opportunity to offer amendments for the consideration of the House when they are taken up. Now, the criticism of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORRIS] is certainly unjust in view of the fact that these bills are both very short. They can be read and easily understood in a very short space of time. He will have

opportunity to offer amendments to them, if he sees fit to offer them for consideration. If they were long and extensive in their provisions and difficult to understand and had complicated questions involved in them, then the criticism which he offers might be justified, but in view of the fact that they are short, simple, and easily understood the criticism, it seems to me, is without merit. Now, in this bill, H. R. 9414, of which this rule, if adopted, will give us prompt consideration, I want to call attention to the fact that it contains a provision which is as follows: "That carriers in the Rural Free Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum increased allowance up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum, and \$24 per mile per annum for each additional mile over 24 miles." This is a just recognition of the honest, efficient, and faithful service being rendered by these employees of the Government of the United States who carry the mails day by day to the homes of the people. The Post Office Department states that there are no more efficient, faithful, honest, and competent employees in the Postal Service than are the rural letter carriers. They travel their routes amid the snows, sleets, and freezing cold of winter, as well as the intense heat and driving rains of summer. Whether the roads are good or bad, whether the clouds are dark and dreary or the sunshine is bright and cheerful, you will find these efficient public servants faithfully discharging their every duty to the delight and comfort of their patrons to whom they carry always the welcome visitor—the daily mail—carrying not only the important business mail but the sweet and affectionate messages of husband to wife, of mother to son, of sweethearts to each other, thus helping the commerce of the Nation in prompt delivery of business mail and making the people happy in prompt dispatch of personal mail. The carrier is thus a public benefactor deserving our kindest consideration. [Applause.]

The expenses of the rural letter carriers have increased enormously, and the facts absolutely show that they have increased to such an extent in increased cost of equipment, feed for his horses, and so forth, that their necessary and unavoidable expense takes away a very large part of the salary which they are receiving, and at the present time, by reason of that fact, many of them are resigning. A few days ago I was in the Post Office Department and I saw a postmaster there from a distant State who came into the Post Office Department to confer with the representative of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, who has, to a considerable extent, the management of the Rural Free Delivery Service, in reference to securing the services of carriers, and he said that in his office they were resigning day by day, and that he could not keep them in the service. That when vacancies occurred the substitute would try it for a while and quit, and he was having a lot of trouble to give the people prompt and necessary service. I wish I had time to longer discuss this situation. I hope this just and equitable provision will appeal to all, and when considered unanimously pass. [Applause.] Now, I call attention to another provision in this bill. It is in reference to fourth-class postmasters, and is as follows:

SEC. 3. That postmasters of the fourth class shall receive the same compensation as provided by law prior to the passage of the act of Congress, "An act to provide revenue to defray war expenses and other purposes," approved October 3, 1917, except that they shall receive 100 per cent of the cancellations up to and including \$100 quarterly.

This is a just and very reasonable provision. I introduced a bill myself on December 5, 1917, in which it was provided that fourth-class postmasters receive "all of the first \$100 cancellation of stamps in his office" and a percentage of additional cancellations, and also "such a sum for rents, fuel, and lights as in the discretion of the Postmaster General may be just and right." I wish this latter provision in my bill was in the pending bill. It is not, but I am glad the first provision for the \$100 cancellation is in the pending bill. The fourth-class postmasters have to pay all the expenses of their business. The Government pays the expense of the first-class post offices and second-class post offices and third-class post offices, but when it comes to the fourth-class post office the postmaster has to pay for his rent, he has to pay for his light, and he has to pay for his fuel and all of the expenses of his office. Do you think that just and right? I do not. For the fourth-class postmaster to receive the \$100 cancellation provided for in the bill to be considered under this rule is at least some recognition of the faithful service which they are performing throughout the country. They should receive it, and I trust you will vote for this rule, so the bill can be considered and this provision enacted into law. They are resigning because they can not afford to discharge the duties required of them for the remuneration which they are receiving at the present time. Do them, at last, this tardy partial justice. [Applause.]

There are other provisions in the bill in reference to city carriers, postal clerks, railway mail clerks, laborers, messen-

gers, and other efficient employees to which I direct your attention, but my limited time forbids my discussing them in detail. I know you will examine them and by voting for this rule give the House an opportunity to consider them, and upon consideration to do what is deemed just, honest, equitable, and right by all whose interest is in any way involved in the several provisions of the bill. To adopt the rule secures consideration. Therefore let us vote to adopt it. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York yields the remnant of his time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman yielded me five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is recognized for one minute, then.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of the House, if I may, on this proposition. In this bill, House bill 9414, the department clerks are covered. It is the understanding that the department clerks, having been taken care of in the amendment that was provided to the legislative appropriation bill, the committee is going to move to strike them from this bill when the time arrives.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] is recognized.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this rule because it gives the House an opportunity to enact legislation of urgent necessity for the postal employees of the Government. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] stated that many men had found it necessary to resign from the service because of the small pay they had been receiving. This is true not only as to the service in the country and small post offices, but especially so in the large cities. Many valued and experienced employees in the post office at St. Louis, Mo., have found it necessary to leave the service because they were not able to live decently and provide necessities and education for their families. Not only, Mr. Speaker, have many been compelled to resign because of the poor pay, but also many others have had to leave due to the fact that the Post Office Department has been applying the gag rule, so much criticized years ago. Postal employees have been called before their superiors and condemned, criticized, and abused unmercifully in many instances because of the connection that the postal employees have with organizations that have for their purpose the betterment of the service. I believed that when Congress enacted the antigag law in the Sixty-second Congress that the postal officials would respect it. That law was enacted August 24, 1912, and is found in section 6 of the Statutes at Large, and, in part, is as follows:

The right of persons employed in the civil service of the United States, either individually or collectively, to petition Congress or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress or to any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with.

Notwithstanding that law, the postmaster of the post office at St. Louis, Mo., on December 15 last, had printed and distributed to all the employees a "special notice and warning to all employees." This notice prohibited any employee from furnishing information on any matter pertaining to the business of the office or the needs of the employees to any persons outside of the service unless permission was first had from either the Post Office Department or the postmaster. This order, in effect, forbids the right of post-office employees to petition Congress, their Representatives in Congress, or any committee of Congress regarding their betterment or their grievances, or to ask for investigation, and so forth, for the purpose of improving the service. In other words, the right given by the Congress to postal employees in the law referred to is being ignored and denied, so far as the Post Office Department is able to do. In fact, it is in effect a repeal of the law of the United States by the executive department of the Government. Congress voted for this law by a large majority of its Members, and I am sure that they want it respected even by the Postmaster General and his subordinates, who are wont to rule with an iron hand over the many faithful and efficient clerks, carriers, and other employees of the Postal Department.

The Postmaster General is opposed to employees acquainting the public with the true state of affairs within the service, yet he maintains a publicity bureau in the department, the sole function of which is to boost the present postal administration. One example of the activity of this news bureau is the fact that on the 22d of December last, three days before Christmas, it sent out a statement to the effect that, though the Christmas

mail was 25 per cent heavier than ever before, it was worked up with little or no delay. This notice was sent out three days before the Christmas mail was really received. In other words, the department's press agent had the mail all disposed of before the mail was in the post offices. We all know that the Christmas mail, unless it be for distant points, is not mailed three days before Christmas. It is evident, therefore, that the press bureau of the Postmaster General does not always furnish information or facts, but oftentimes misinformation. Practically the only way to obtain correct information is from the splendid men and women who work in minor positions and who know of the difficulties of rendering efficient service because of the fault or faults being higher up. What Congress wants to know is how to give the country better service than we are now receiving and have been receiving for a number of years in the Post Office Department. If the post-office clerks and carriers and the members of organizations of which these men and women are members are to be denied the right to petition Congress and to write their Representatives the true situation, then there is not much hope for an improvement in the horrible service that we are now receiving in the Post Office Department.

I am unable to understand how the President, knowing these conditions and the violation of this act of Congress, as he must, permits it, for we have the views of the President concerning such matters of record. From his work on Congressional Government, published some years ago, I find this language:

Unless Congress have and use every means of acquainting itself with the acts and disposition of the administrative agents of the Government the country must be helpless to learn how it is being served, and unless Congress both scrutinize these things and sift them by every form of discussion the country must remain in embarrassing and crippling ignorance of every force which it is most important it should understand and direct.

The informing function of Congress should be specially preferred, even to its legislative function. The argument is not only that the discussed and interrogated administration is the only pure and efficient administration, but, more than that, that the only well self-governing people is that people which discusses and interrogates its administration.

Mr. Speaker, I am personally acquainted with hundreds of the efficient employees in the post office of my city, St. Louis. They are men and women of integrity and ability; they have been giving most efficient service; their pay has been and is very small. These employees are as good citizens in every respect as we have in our city. Many of them have served in their positions for many years. This bill will give to them some increase in their salaries. It is not enough, considering the conditions in which we are at present living. This bill provides only for this increase during the next fiscal year, but I understand it is the intention of the Post Office Committee to offer an amendment to make this provision for increase a permanent law. If no member of the committee does so, I shall myself offer it, believing, as I do, that the needs are not only temporary but are permanent. I congratulate the Committee on Post Offices for bringing in this bill. It speaks the sentiment of Members of Congress generally as to needs of an increase in pay for the postal employees. It is another evidence of the fact also that the House of Representatives is willing to assume the responsibility for legislation for the benefit of the Postal Service and its employees, even though it has not the support of the Postmaster General and other officials of that department whose judgment and action he controls. I mean, of course, his principal assistants and the postmasters throughout the country whose appointments are made more on the ground of their partisanship than their ability to handle this great department of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the rule.

The question was taken, and the rule was adopted.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time provided for general debate on this bill be controlled by the chairman of the committee and the ranking gentleman on the other side, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENSON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate on this bill be divided half and half between himself and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENSON]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRINT OF INDUSTRIAL CREDITS BILL.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 1,000 copies of the Senate war finance corporation bill as it passed the Senate, together with the House amendments, be printed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that 1,000 copies of the Senate finance corporation bill as it passed the Senate and also as it passed the House be printed. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

INCREASED COMPENSATION, EMPLOYEES POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Accordingly the House automatically resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9414, with Mr. CARAWAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service, and for other purposes.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, there is no question that we approach that gives more difficulty than the settlement of the question of salaries. And in this particular department of the Government it is, perhaps, more difficult than elsewhere, by reason of the fact that the compensation of employees in the Postal Department is computed in so many various ways. A flat per cent, perhaps, would not do justice to the greater portion of the employees in that department, as it would in the other departments, because of the fact that under the law as it exists and the discretion that is in the department with reference to some of these salaries, and the arbitrary rule fixed as to the manner of computing salaries in others, makes it impossible to utilize any one rule for the control of the salaries. I think it is hardly necessary for me to say that we can not now justly measure the compensation of employees of the Government by the rules that existed when the living conditions of the country were better than they are now. Nor is it necessary for me to advise this House, because it is well known to us all, as to the increased cost of living, and therefore the inadequacy now of a salary that obtained during the period when living was cheaper.

The committee has attempted, and it has done the best it can, the adjustment of the salaries of the postal employees. It is understood by the House that there is a distinction between the departmental employees and the postal employees. When we speak of the employees of the Government in the department, we mean those employees engaged in the service of the Government at the seat of government. When we speak of the Postal Service, we mean the whole service performed by the Post Office Department throughout the United States and in those foreign countries where it has a service.

As I remarked in the beginning, it is exceedingly hard to arbitrarily fix a just rate of compensation. No one wants to give more than is just, because we all want to protect the Government and the people the best we can in the proper distribution and the use of the revenues. Nor does any just man want to give less than ought to be given. Now, perhaps it is true that the cost of living has advanced 33 per cent; some people think it has increased more than that. A salary that was adequate before that advance is not now adequate, and yet we have not undertaken to cover by the increase in this bill the full cost of living.

But we have, in the figures fixed, required some measure of sacrifice on the part of employees, and we have fixed only the salaries that we think meet the present condition.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. HELM. The gentleman refers to the increased cost of living. Does not that also affect those who do not work for the Government as well as those who do work for the Government?

Mr. MOON. Of course it does. There is no question about that. But we are not dealing with the salaries of those who do not work for the Government.

Mr. HELM. I grant you that is true, but the men who do not work for the Government, the men who have not got Government jobs, and have to eke out their own living—those men have to sustain the increased cost of living to their families and then have this added burden of aiding these people covered by this bill, and that results in increased taxes on them.

Mr. MOON. Well, they may pay a little of it, but not much. People in that fix do not pay much revenue to any government.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MOON. I will answer your question, but I do not want the gentleman to put a speech in my remarks. It is true we are not dealing with the people outside of the Government employ, and it may be true that the salaries on the outside are not increased in proportion with those that we propose to increase, but I think that wherever a man is worthy of his employment he should receive a just measure of pay, and we can not in this House take outside salaries as a rule or standard of adjustment of salaries of the men who give their time and

brains to the United States service, but it is perhaps also true that salaries in general have increased much.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. MOON. For a question; yes.

Mr. HELM. What will the aggregate increase of this bill amount to?

Mr. MOON. I will answer that after a while. I will reach that before I finish and put in the RECORD as Exhibit C a statement from the Post Office Department as to increased cost and expense under this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when we come to the consideration, as we do in this bill, of the salaries of rural carriers, I want to observe that in my judgment, and that is the view of the department, if the rural-carrier system or service of the United States were placed on a contract basis, embracing the 43,800 routes in the United States, the mail could be carried over them successfully under that system at a decrease of more than \$20,000,000 to this Government below the cost at which it is now carried.

It is also true that upon many of the routes the service is of short duration and on some long, but the diversity of routes in the United States, due to the diversity in the topography of the country, is such that it is absolutely impossible for a committee or for any Government to fix a rule that will be exactly just to all in all cases.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. In a moment.

Now, for this service there has been gradually an increase of compensation, until the salaries now, on a standard route of 24 miles, are \$1,200 per annum, and they go down in proportion to the decrease in the length of the route.

This bill provides for an increase of 15 per cent upon the salary of each carrier under the existing conditions, and it provides for \$24 per mile for every mile per annum traveled in excess of the standard route of 24 miles.

"Why," you ask this committee, "do you make that increase?" The answer has been made before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads by 151 Members of this House. It has also been made by a vast number of others, and the facts have been furnished by the department. The cost of maintaining vehicles and the horses that draw them, where they are horse-drawn vehicles, has gone up nearly 100 per cent in many sections of the country, and that has increased the cost of living in many sections of the country, and, of course, the cost of living has gone up to those carriers. So to-day, according to the proof as it is laid before the committee, the salaries are perhaps 25 per cent less than they were two years ago, although measured in dollars and cents they are the same. We have felt that it was but just to these men who were performing this service and have no other means of subsistence that they be cared for, in part at least, as to the increased cost of the service that they are required to maintain.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman spoke of the contract system for the rural mail. We hear a good deal about that from the Post Office Department. Why do they advocate the contract system for the rural carrier and never say a word about applying that system to the city carriers and the railway-mail clerks? Would you save money in the delivery of city mail on the contract system, and in the same way in the Railway Mail Service?

Mr. MOON. The gentleman does not understand me as advocating that system. I am simply stating the naked facts, as taken from the reports of the department and the information that we have. I have not a bit of doubt that if every bit of it were placed under contract it could be done at a less figure than now, because you can not handle the vast number of men in that service as easily as contractors could handle them. Officials of the Government of the United States, while always regarded as exceedingly competent, are not always competent and are not always careful supervisory officials. They are not personally interested.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Would not the same reason for placing the rural-delivery mail under the contract system apply to the city-delivery mail?

Mr. MOON. It might. I was speaking of the contract system. If the gentleman will allow me to digress for a moment—

Mr. RAMSEYER. If there is a difference, what is it?

Mr. MOON. I do not know that there is a material difference. But, talking about putting the Post Office under the contract system, I had once a written proposition from men who were backed by property worth \$100,000,000 to take the Postal System of the United States—the transportation of the mails—and, still retaining it under the dominant control of the Postmaster

General and in obedience to the law, it proposed to take over all these offices and, under a contract to reorganize the system and to pay every dollar of expense of the whole Post Office Department, including the whole Postal Service and the departmental service, and turn over a profit at the end of a year of \$15,000,000 to this Government; and they claimed they could put in their own private pockets \$20,000,000 for their own use. Whether it can be done or not I do not know. I refer to it merely as an idea of contract and the possibilities that may arise under a service where it is contracted for rather than an official service like this. Of course, I know it could not be done under the law and the Constitution, so far as the full control of the whole department is concerned, nor would it be advisable in all respects if it could be done.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Is there any other country that has its mail delivered under a contract system such as the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. MOON. I do not know. Some countries have pretty much the same system as ours. Ours is borrowed largely from other countries.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The gentleman has not in mind any country that delivers its mail by contract?

Mr. MOON. No; not to any greater extent than we do. We have a contract system for the star routes. The star-route service is costing less in proportion than the rural service.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There are not very many star routes now.

Mr. MOON. That is an illustration, right in our own country, of the difference between the two systems. The one is just as efficient as the other. There is no question about that. We stand here protecting our carriers in this service in our districts, and we know—every one of us who has thought about it at all—that a better service could be rendered for less money; but this is a fixed service and we are not going to quit it, and I am not proposing to do so.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. In colonial days the mail was delivered in this country under a contract system, was it not?

Mr. MOON. I am not familiar with that old system. I do not know how it was done. I was not here then. [Laughter.] But I must pass from that. I feel justified in recommending to the House this rural-carrier proposition, and I do it only upon the ground that it is necessary in consequence of the method and system now adopted for the carrying of the mail to readjust these salaries.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman very properly and correctly said a while ago that the reason for these proposed increases is on account of the increased cost of living.

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. I notice that the first part of this bill, H. R. 9414, provides that it shall be in effect during the period of the war and for 90 days after the proclamation of peace, and so forth.

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. Does the gentleman contemplate that there will be such a great change within 90 days after peace is declared as will obviate the necessity for this increase?

Mr. MOON. I think it was regarded as hardly wise to make this a permanent increase. Yet we wanted to carry it perhaps beyond the terms of an annual appropriation bill, as the increase adopted the other day with reference to other employees was.

Conditions are entirely different in time of war than they will be afterwards, and I assume that within 90 days after peace there will be a great difference from the way things are during the war.

Mr. HAMLIN. The gentleman may be right, but my idea is that it will take 6 months or 12 months, and perhaps longer, after the end of the war before we see any material difference.

Mr. MOON. It may be 12 years before we see peace. I do not know anything about that. Now I want to pass from that section.

Mr. HASTINGS. Before the gentleman passes from that section will he yield for a question?

Mr. MOON. Just for a question. I do not want to take up much time here, and I want to get on with this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the provision giving \$24 per annum for each additional mile over 24 miles apply to motor-drawn as well as horse-drawn vehicles?

Mr. MOON. It applies to all alike.

Mr. HASTINGS. Just one other question. On page 2—

Mr. MOON. Wait until we get to page 2.

Mr. HASTINGS. It is not the same section.

Mr. MOON. All right, if it is in the same section.

Mr. HASTINGS. I want to ask about the increase to letter carriers in the city delivery service.

Mr. MOON. I have not gotten to that yet. Wait until I get there.

Mr. HASTINGS. I wanted to ask if that applied to village delivery as well as city delivery.

Mr. MOON. No. Villages and cities are not the same thing.

Mr. HASTINGS. I know; but I do not see where there is any provision for an increase in the compensation for village delivery.

Mr. MOON. There is none.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman is right about that. There is no such provision. Now, passing from this, I want to go to the section that provides for the compensation of clerks. That is an illustration of the fact that you can not properly compensate, either by a flat or graduated scale, all of the officials of the department. The clerks have certain fixed salaries. At this time they enter the first grade at \$800 and go on through the grades continuously. Now, this bill does not give the clerks or carriers—and I may discuss the two together—the 15 per cent increase, but it gives promotion to the clerks and to the carriers. Instead of entering the service at \$800 a year they will enter at \$1,000, and they are promoted up to the highest grade. Now, this is the section that is known as the Madden section of the bill. It is a matter with which my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], is very familiar, and which I want him to discuss more at length than I do. The increase provided by this method of payment, this automatic promotion that is provided for in this bill, I am advised by gentlemen who have looked into it, will amount to about 15 per cent. Some think it will be 18 per cent. I take it that it is hard to tell exactly what the increase will be, because we do not know exactly what the number of clerks will be of the different grades.

Mr. GORDON. An increase from \$800 to \$1,000 a year is an increase of 25 per cent, is it not?

Mr. MOON. Yes; but that does not run all the way through.

Mr. GORDON. That was the only instance the gentleman mentioned, and that is an increase of 25 per cent.

Mr. MOON. I understand that.

Mr. MADDEN. If the chairman will permit me, when you go from \$1,400 to \$1,500 at the top, you would not call that an increase of 25 per cent?

Mr. MOON. Oh, no. I want to say that you have got to count the increase upon the whole—the aggregate increase.

Mr. BLACK. In order that the House may clearly understand this reclassification, is it not a fact that each class is raised \$200 per annum?

Mr. MOON. Oh, no.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman just said from \$1,400 to \$1,500. That is \$100.

Mr. MOON. Some of them are raised \$200 a year, but not all. This is an increase that is going to cost the Treasury a good deal of money. I will ask permission to place in the RECORD a statement from the Post Office Department in reference to the cost to the Government of the increase in the salaries, including this very provision which the gentleman here is discussing. It is a more intelligent statement of the approximate cost than I could make, because I am not as familiar with it as they are. It is well for the House to know what the position of the department is in reference to this measure. I do not understand that the department is opposed to the increase of salary. They may be opposed perhaps to the amount, but not to the principle of increase. Under the statement of the department, which I am going to place in the RECORD, it will show that the whole increase under the bill would be about \$25,685,000 for the first year. If gentlemen desire to examine the details of it they will find in that statement the approximate cost of this measure.

Now, in this brief and disconnected presentation of the bill to the House, I want to refer later to the increase provided for assistant postmasters. Additional compensation to postmasters at the first and second class post offices is not provided for in the bill. I intend to move to strike out the words "departmental clerks" in this bill so that there will be no conflict between this bill and one passed a few days ago in the House. We provide also for watchmen, messengers, and laborers, as provided for in section 2, of 15 per cent increase. That is on the same theory that we have already discussed.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will the gentleman state what the substitute carriers now get?

Mr. MOON. They get 35 cents. I am taking up the sections and briefly considering them, because I can not discuss them in full.

The provision for fourth-class postmasters in section 3 is badly worded, and is not printed exactly as it came from the committee. I am going to offer an amendment. It was not intended to appropriate any of the increased postage on first-class matter for war revenue—that is, the excess over 2 cents. The purpose was to amend the existing law under which for the first quarter they receive 50 per cent of \$100 salary, and so on. We propose to amend it so as to double the compensation, by allowing 100 per cent instead of 50 per cent on first \$100, and I will offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. I want to inquire about the grades, on top of page 2.

Mr. MOON. I have gone over that and prefer not to go back to it. I am on another section of the bill.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I want to ask the gentleman about the fourth-class postmasters. I did not catch how he proposed to make the increase.

Mr. MOON. Of the first \$100 that is collected by cancellation in the fourth-class office the postmaster gets now 50 per cent. We are providing that he shall have 100 per cent. I will offer an amendment to change the language, as it does not seem exactly what the committee intended.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Under the present language he would get the war revenue on first-class matter, the additional cent?

Mr. MOON. Yes; and that is why I may offer an amendment.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. This bill carries nothing for the increase of clerk hire.

Mr. MOON. The law provides for that now.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I meant to speak of clerks at the second and third class post offices.

Mr. MOON. I am obliged to my friend from Oklahoma for referring to the third-class post offices. The committee has not seen fit to make any recommendation in reference to that office. In fact, it has made no recommendation for additional compensation except for the fourth-class offices, and that for obvious reasons. A third-class postmaster gets between one and two thousand dollars per annum. If he gets in the office receipts between \$1,900 and \$2,100 he gets a thousand dollars per annum, and so on up until you reach \$2,000. He is allowed under the law not in excess of \$500 for rent, \$100 for fuel, and he is allowed compensation, in the judgment of the Postmaster General, for hire of assistants in the office. That must of necessity be left within the discretion of the Postmaster General.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Is there any limitation on the amount of clerk hire that the department can allow him to expend?

Mr. MOON. Yes; there is a limitation on that. I have forgotten the exact amount, but the gentleman can find it by reference to the postal laws. I think it is \$800 in larger third-class offices. The Postmaster General fixes that in conformity to the service performed in the office, and the necessities of the service. There are various provisions affecting various conditions. As a whole, we did not feel it necessary to increase the salaries of these gentlemen that may reach \$2,000 per annum.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I do not think it would be necessary to increase the salaries, but if what some of these officials state is true they certainly are not getting sufficient for clerk hire.

Mr. MOON. I can not give the gentleman the amount, because the amount is within the discretion of the Postmaster General. Such an allowance is made as seems to be necessary to meet the conditions, and must be left that way. Sometimes there are very unusual conditions in the office, and extra men would be allowed at one place that would not be allowed at another. You can not have a general rule covering the whole country as to the pay of the third-class postmaster when there is such a difference in the service, such a difference in the character and value of the service.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is not the limit allowed for clerk hire in third-class post offices largely based on appropriations made by Congress for that purpose?

Mr. MOON. Of course. While the statute gives the Postmaster General discretion in dealing with this question of

clerk hire, and so forth, if the appropriation does not carry enough money, of course the Postmaster General can not comply with the requests, but I think the appropriation act this year will carry it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have frequently been advised by the gentleman in charge of salaries, and so on, that he believes that this was a legitimate demand in favor of an increase, because of an increase in business, but that I will have to wait until next July, because the appropriation was not sufficient.

Mr. MOON. Unquestionably where it is not sufficient the Postmaster General can not carry out the mandates of the statute.

Mr. HASTINGS. Will not the gentleman change his statement from saying that he has frequently been told that by the Post Office Department to saying that he has been invariably told that?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think "frequently" covers the gentleman's statement as well.

Mr. MOON. That is a row between the Post Office people and you gentlemen.

Mr. HASTINGS. I have never had any other reply from the Post Office Department than that the appropriation was exhausted, and that we would have to wait until after June 30.

Mr. MOON. If they have not the money they can not supply it. That means simply this, as a rule, that you are asking more than you ought to in some places.

Mr. HASTINGS. I know of one case where there is a third-class post office—

Mr. MOON. I can not yield.

Mr. HASTINGS. Just a minute.

Mr. MOON. No; not a minute.

Mr. HASTINGS. Let me just make this statement—where they were allowed the great sum of \$5 a month for clerk hire, and they were generous enough to increase it to \$6.

Mr. MOON. It is possible that that is a case where they ought not to have even allowed \$5. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to page 2, the latter part of section 1.

Mr. MOON. I have passed that. I do not want to go back to a discussion of that. The gentleman will excuse me. What does he want to know?

Mr. KEARNS. I see you have taken care of all the clerks with the exception of 120 chief clerks.

Mr. MOON. Chief clerks?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes; that this bill does not increase their salaries.

Mr. MOON. It is not our intention to increase the salaries of the chief clerks, the supervising officials, in this bill. They start in at about \$2,000.

Mr. KEARNS. You have increased the salaries of grade 10 clerks to \$2,000, getting the same as these chief clerks.

Mr. MOON. Who has?

Mr. KEARNS. Grade 9 at \$1,900, grade 10 at \$2,000.

Mr. MOON. Oh, those are the automatic promotions of the postal clerks.

Mr. KEARNS. Oh, that is what they are.

Mr. MOON. Of course, to the supervisory gentlemen we are not giving any attention at all. They are getting enough now.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I do not want to take all of this time in general debate. How much time have I consumed, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 35 minutes.

Mr. MOON. I must not yield for many more questions, though I will yield now to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DENISON. The first section of the bill provides that clerks in the sixth grade, as I understand it, with salaries running from \$1,000 to \$1,500, shall have a certain increase. Will the gentleman state how many clerks there are now and what the salaries are?

Mr. MOON. There are the same number of classes. I will leave that question for the discussion of the gentleman from Illinois. I have discussed it already. I have passed from that several times and I can not go back to it.

I come now to section 4, which provides:

That the Postmaster General shall have authority to investigate conditions arising from contracts in the star route and screen wagon service with a view to adjusting compensation and adjust the same in cases where the facts disclose the necessity for such adjustment.

Owing to the conditions existing in every branch of the service which are at such variance with the conditions that existed at the time the contracts were made, it is thought best to let the department readjust these matters so that the department would pay really the value for the service that it is having done.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that there are a number of other contracts, printing contracts, in which contractors are losing all of their fortunes in attempting to carry out contracts with the Government. It is well for us to make men stand by their contracts and make the securities stand by them, but where conditions have so radically changed as to overwhelm a contractor in attempting to carry out a contract, and where the Government if it were to make a contract to-day could not make it for twice the amount that it had made the contract for previously, we have thought it well in the interest of equity and good conscience to allow the Postmaster General to readjust these contracts as to the screen-wagon service and the star route service, and I have no doubt that this bill ought to be amended in that respect to cover other contracts.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Does the gentleman feel in view of the fact that the department has not shown much liberality in matters of this kind in the past that this provision protects the interest of star carriers sufficiently?

Mr. MOON. I think so. The star carrier nor the screen-wagon man has any legal right to demand any action at all.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I appreciate that as a matter of law that is true, but in view of the further statement of the gentleman that many of these have made improvident contracts growing out of the large increase in necessary expenses, would it not be prudent to insert a provision to the effect that if the star carrier is dissatisfied with the adjustment offered he may, on giving 60 days' notice in writing, have the right to surrender his contract?

Mr. MOON. No; never. You take away from the Government its right to confer all the power upon the other contractors. We do not intend to deprive the Government of the right to hold a man to a contract who ought to be held. We are simply giving the right to the Government, in a case where it would be bad conscience not to do it, to correct it. The other way you simply say to the Government of the United States: "You can make a contract, and the contract you have made shall be binding upon you but not upon the other side."

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Since you have left such a broad discretion in the department and provided no real increase, it occurred to me it ought to be safeguarded.

Mr. MOON. You have got to make the statute directory or you have got to make it mandatory, and you never ought to make a mandatory statute on the department for the release of contractors who are under bond and securities to perform a duty for the Government.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I will.

Mr. FIELDS. Does not the gentleman think it might be well to guarantee to the star-route carrier a certain increase, the same as you have guaranteed to the rural carriers?

Mr. MOON. Why, no. The star-route contractor is dealing at arm's length with the Government. He is a contractor; he has entered into a contract for the purpose of making money out of the Government, and if he fails it is his misfortune. The other man is the servant of the Government, performing that duty which he is directed to do. There is no analogy between the two, in my judgment.

Mr. FIELDS. Both are performing services for the Government.

Mr. MOON. And, as suggested, there are different star-route services. The service is by no means the same always. No; we can not afford to make the Government powerless in these matters by mandatory statute, but we can afford to vest discretion in the executive officers of the Government to relieve where the conditions are unjust, inequitable, and it is a mercy to the contractor.

Mr. FIELDS. I realize the force of the chairman's argument with regard to what might grow out of permitting contractors to surrender their contracts, but it is a fact that the star-route carriers are poorly paid.

Mr. MOON. That is their fault and nobody else; they made the contract.

Mr. FIELDS. In cases where there have been abnormal increases—

Mr. MOON. That is just what we intend to relieve. There are instances, some of them before this House now, where the conditions have been so radically changed since the contract was made that it would be entirely unjust for the Government to hold the contractor to the contract, but it will not do to give relief in cases of that kind to pass a general statute and throw down the bars and let every man go over who wants to do so. There must be discretionary power lodged in the department and not a mandatory statute forcing the department to abrogate Government contracts at the will of the man making the contract.

Mr. FIELDS. Most all of the arguments in favor of the increased compensation for the various Government employees have been based upon the ground of the increased cost of living within the last few months. Is not that the fact in the case of the star-route carrier?

Mr. MOON. Possibly so, but the gentleman fails to catch the very clear, just, and legal distinction between the two classes of services.

Mr. FIELDS. Oh, well, I am not taking advantage of a legal technicality—

Mr. MOON. I make a contract with you. I may release you from it, but you have no right to demand it. The Government makes a contract with an individual for the carrying of mail. It may be a hard contract, but the Government, controlled by the Congress—it can not act without its authority—ought to have the right to ameliorate the condition; but we ought not to give the contractor himself the right to say what shall be done or shall not be done, because it would be but an idle performance for the Government to make the contract. Now, when you come to a servant of the Government, a man who is paid by salary, he has got no voice in it at all, but you give or take from him as you see fit in the way of salary.

Mr. FIELDS. But he enters into a contract with the Government when he accepts the position, and you enter into a contract with the star-route carrier, and if you increase the one because of the increased cost of living why not increase the other?

Mr. MOON. The gentleman and I are so far apart as to our understanding of the character of the services and the obligations existing in the one case under contract and the other as a discretionary pay by the Government to its employees that there is no room whatever to discuss that question. The fact that we say as a Congress that our employees in the Postal Service ought to have more money because of that condition is no sort of an argument to relieve a man who has gone into a contract with his eyes open to perform a certain duty.

Mr. FIELDS. Here is a man who went in with his eyes wide open, too.

Mr. MOON. He can not act alone at his will.

Mr. FIELDS. He can, but the star-route carrier can not. You are giving an increase to a man who can get out and go if he wishes, but you refuse to give it to a man who can not get out.

Mr. MOON. No; we are not refusing, but we are refusing to let a star-route man make a contract and then come in and say he will not perform it.

Mr. FIELDS. I am not suggesting you do that, but I am simply suggesting that you guarantee an increase in compensation to the man who can not get out if you are going to guarantee an increase in compensation to a man who can get out.

Mr. MOON. That is exactly what this section does. It guarantees it in the discretion of the department. Every case rests upon its own merits. And it would be unwise to make a general law to cover all cases. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say only a word about this motor-truck proposition. It is a bill that has met the approval of the Senate and the Post Office Committee and is on the calendar here for consideration. We thought it wise to have it placed under the rule in this bill. This bill is not a mere salary bill; it is a general legislative bill.

The department insists that if it is permitted under the provisions of this bill to run these motor trucks from the cities into the country that they will gather up the products of the country and bring them into the market at much less price than the farmer himself could do. The farmer has a small amount of fruit or vegetables or grain, and he does not feel like quitting his work to carry it into the city in a wagon and lose a day, inasmuch as the cost would be too great and the value of his time and his team would be too great, while the motor truck can take it into the city and deliver it to his commission merchant and he will obtain something out of it, whereas it would perish upon the farm. And then the accumulation of farm products of this sort and of other kinds in a large city, where there is a great demand for food, would reduce the price of food to the masses of the people. And if this Government ought to do anything it ought to encourage every movement possible to secure to the citizens of this country the means of a good living as cheaply as possible.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOON. I will yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. You stated a few moments ago that the possible amount of increase in the salaries estimated by the department is something like \$25,000,000.

Mr. MOON. Twenty-five millions for the first year, I believe, and \$35,000,000 for the next year and \$48,000,000 for the next.

Mr. GALLAGHER. What I wanted to get at is this: Can you give the House any idea of the possible increase in the amount of revenues derived from first-class postage?

Mr. MOON. That will be derived from first-class postage?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOON. I think from the best estimates that the amount of first-class postage under the new law—

Mr. GALLAGHER. Annually.

Mr. MOON. Yes. It is purely a guess. Nobody can tell you; but it is estimated that it would be \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000.

Mr. GALLAGHER. It will not make much difference, then, with the revenues of the department?

Mr. MOON. It will make some difference, I imagine. And I think under this truck proposition there will be a considerable source of revenue to the Government as well as benefit to the people. I will place in the Record as Exhibit A to my remarks statement from the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

Now, there are one or two other sections that I wish to refer to. You will remember that we passed in the last Congress a provision that gave 10 or 15 per cent—10, I believe—to increase to persons drawing salaries from \$480 to \$1,000. By some sort of construction—I know not what, but perhaps upon the technical theory that the section would apply to those who went into the service after the passage of the law rather than those who were in it—the comptroller has held that these people were not entitled under that act to that increase. We have put a provision in this bill that is retroactive in its character and requires the payment of money to those people for the last year. It is not right that those employees, getting a little, low salary, up to \$1,000, should be deprived of the compensation that we intended by an unjust ruling of a Comptroller of the Treasury when men getting other and larger and better salaries all over this country got the benefit of that act.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Did you discuss section 3 at all? What difference does that make at the present time?

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman mean that one for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act?

Mr. EMERSON. It relates to cancellation up to \$100 for fourth-class postmasters. How does that change the present law?

Mr. MOON. I have discussed that.

Mr. EMERSON. I did not hear the gentleman, although I was sitting here all the time.

Mr. MOON. Well, I explained to the gentlemen, I think, that under the present law the fourth-class postmaster gets 50 per cent of the first quarter \$100 cancellations in the office. Now we are changing it so as to give him 100 per cent. Then I remarked, too, in that connection that the language did not, perhaps, carry out the view of the committee fully, and that there would be an amendment offered there. And I further suggested that it was not the intention of the committee, clearly, to give in this estimate the benefit of the revenue that arises between the 2 and 3 cent postage, the extra 1 cent being intended for war purposes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another section which is made in order under the rule, and that is to increase or permit the increase of deposits in the postal savings banks from \$2,000 up to \$3,000. I have a very interesting report from the department on that question, which I will place in the Record as Exhibit B to my remarks. A very large amount of revenue was placed on deposit in these banks after the change was made a year or two ago as to the limit which they could make of deposits. We were advised that people desired to deposit very large sums, as expressed at almost every office in the country daily, and that many millions of dollars more can be collected and paid into the postal savings by this very change in the act.

When we come to these sections of the bill which I have been briefly discussing and presenting to you in an impromptu way, the members of the committee will take pleasure in giving a more extended explanation.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. LOBECK. At the present time we have about 5,700 postal-savings institutions; that is, where you can receive money out of 56,000 money-order offices in the United States. Have you given it study; and, if so, do you not think it well to increase the number of these postal money-order places?

Mr. MOON. Well, we have not given any consideration to that, and the department, so far as I know, has not. And what the effect of that would be I do not know and what the cost would be I do not know.

Mr. Chairman, I have said all I desire to say about this bill at this time, and I now ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENSON] to use some of his time.

EXHIBIT A.

MOTOR-TRUCK DELIVERY IN POSTAL SERVICE.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS,
Washington, D. C., September 4, 1917.

The committee met, pursuant to call, in the committee room, Hon. John A. Moon (chairman) presiding.

STATEMENT OF HON. J. I. BLAKESLEE, FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

The CHAIRMAN. Gen. Blakeslee, please explain these bills in full.
Gen. BLAKESLEE. This experimental legislation is intended to ascertain whether or not a system of collection and delivery of mail that does not exist to-day is practicable. If the experiment is a success—
It will provide a direct means of communication and conveyance between mailing patrons in cities and rural territory that it is not possible to provide at minimum cost to the Postal Service or to the patron at this time.

It will assist in the effort to reduce the cost of living by eliminating useless and expensive operations in the postal means of communication between producer and consumer.

It will permit the producer to continue production and the labor incident thereto instead of suspending production or labor while conveying produce to consumers.

It will extend the postal zone of collection-and-delivery service in the vicinity of large cities to the point where the actual farmer-producer is domiciled rather than to where only suburban residents and nonproducers live.

Routes 50 miles in radius from the central post office rather than routes 6 miles in radius from the nearest substation of the central post office. Thus the local parcel-post zone rate of approximately one-half cent per pound will apply whereas a charge of first-zone rate, of 1 cent per pound, is now made within such radius.

Only 288 of the present 43,562 existing rural routes emanate from the 50 largest cities in the United States, and of this number of routes none originates at New York City, Philadelphia, Brooklyn, San Francisco, Newark, Jersey City, or Worcester, Mass., or any of the substations or branch offices thereof.

The postal patron in any of the 50 cities will directly benefit from the increased service and improved methods of communication with the genuine rural population and vice versa when the proposed legislation shall have been enacted and the maximum facilities provided. All other communities, wherever found, likewise and in proportion to their population.

This legislation will increase the revenues of the Postal Service. It will also increase the cost of operation of the Postal Service. It will, if efficiently administered, show a net income to the Postal Service under present weight limits and postage charges or conveyance of parcel-post mail only. Any revenues from conveyance of first, second, or third class that may be carried would be net.

It will permit of a practical use of the highways upon which millions of dollars for improvements have been expended and for which nearly \$85,000,000 of Federal funds have been appropriated.

It will reduce the cost of postage on farm products and thereby increase the amount forwarded through the mails. Thus equalize the balance of trade between farmers and consumers which at this time is not equalized in a ratio of about 8 to 1 against the farmer.

It will provide a legitimate means of extension of parcel-post mail facilities into territory where no mail service is possible at this time and where there is no means of conveyance except that which is the property of and is operated by the producer, always at serious loss to himself and to the public that depends upon maximum efficient production.

Specific answers to questions propounded by Mr. Madden and other members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives, relative to H. R. 5640.

What size truck will be used?

Maximum 1-ton capacity.

What will such a truck cost?

One-half ton, \$455. One ton, \$1,800.

What daily mileage will it make?

Average 100 miles per day.

What will it cost to operate?

At present cost of gasoline, tires, and materials, \$1,800 to \$2,200 a year; driver, \$1,200; total, \$3,400.

Of what does such cost consist?

One hundred miles per day, 313 days a year, 31,300 miles.

ONE-HALF TON TRUCK.

12 miles per gallon of gasoline, 2,609 gallons at 25 cents.....	\$652.00
31,300 miles on tires, at 14 cents per mile.....	465.50
31,300 miles—repairs, at 1 cent per mile.....	313.00
Oil, grease, and incidentals, at 1 cent per mile.....	78.00
Garage rental, at \$7 a month.....	84.00
Depreciation, 25 per cent.....	114.00
Interest on investment.....	22.50

Total.....1,729.00

Salary of driver.....1,200.00

2,929.00

ONE-TON TRUCK.

10 miles per gallon of gasoline, 3,130 gallons at 25 cents.....	782.50
31,300 miles on tires, at 14 cents per mile.....	468.50
31,300 miles—repairs, at 1 cent per mile.....	313.00
Oil, grease, and incidentals, at 1 cent per mile.....	78.00
Garage rental, at \$7 per month.....	84.00
Depreciation, 25 per cent.....	465.00
Interest on investment.....	93.00

Total.....2,284.00

Salary of driver.....1,200.00

3,484.00

Per day.....11.13

Per mile......11

Per pound, based on 1 ton per day......0055

Depreciation, 25 per cent. Actual use of car, three years, and sale or exchange value at end of that period.

Note all estimates are maximum costs, at present high prices for labor and equipment, although it is believed that a one-half ton car will be utilized in a majority of instances, as it will transport not more than approximately one-half ton each way, while being capable of overload capacity, if necessary, in emergency.

To carry one-half ton each way, as contemplated, on a 50-mile route, out and return, the cost would be.....\$7,765
Plus labor.....1,200

Total.....2,965

Or 9.46 per day, or \$0.095 per mile, or 0.0047 cent per pound.

What will be the salary of the driver?

Maximum, \$1,200 per annum, he to provide his own substitute and pay for same within his salary.

What plan is contemplated to assemble the material at the producing point?

Regular schedules, giving time of arrival at points where produce may appear for transmission, producer to supply containers for protection pending arrival of the carrier. In fact, similar treatment as now prevails in the collection and delivery of mail on rural routes.

What will be the plan of disposing of the supplies?

The same treatment as now prevails in the disposition of produce handled on rural routes, with the additional direct supervision of a rural agent—employee of the post office or the postmaster—who will be expected to encourage direct commercial relations between producer and consumer; to increase the quantity of marketable matter carried; to recommend amendments of route or schedule to accommodate patrons; to insure efficiency of operation, eliminating indirect service, superfluous handling, treatment of undelivered or spoiled produce; to keep record and issue bulletins of produce and supplies, with prices thereof, to producers and consumer patrons; to provide for regularity of service when daily supply can be secured from any given number of producers for direct delivery to any given number of consumers.

It is not contemplated in this measure to do anything more than provide the cheapest, most direct, and most efficient possible mail service; to collect supplies from producers and to deliver the same to consumers.

NOTE.—This would apparently increase the costs of operation as an overhead charge, but the service rendered should pay for itself through increased returns above the estimated income.

Is the Government to solicit trade?

No. It will advertise the mail facilities that will promote trade; publish the names of producers and consumers; the amount of produce that can be supplied by producers and the prices therefor as listed by producers. Also, the names of the consumers and the quantities of produce required by each, and, if stated, to set forth the price the consumer is willing to pay. This is at present effective in the "Farm to table" movement already attempted.

Is it contemplated that the Government shall guarantee payment of those supplying the goods?

Only as provided in the Postal Laws and Regulations relative to C. O. D. parcels.

What charges are to be made for the service?

Parcel-post mail rates.

How many places are there in the country at which this system can be operated during the entire year?

It is impossible to state in detail, although it is certainly feasible at any point where fairly good roads appear. The regularity of service is subject to weather conditions. I am inclined to believe that if I could accurately answer this question, and some of the others that follow, there would be no need for an experiment.

Should the department not make some extra charge to the producer for the special transportation of his products?

Absolutely not. Producers and other mail patrons are already overcharged for mail service for the benefit of other mail users who do not pay the cost of their mail service.

What saving to the consumer will be made by the adoption of this plan?

The consumer in any city where no rural delivery exists will save nearly 50 per cent of the postage now paid on any article presented for mailing on the highway or in the villages located on the highway traversed by this service. Indirectly the consumer will save the difference in a reduced price that may be set between the consumer and a producer with whom the producer now has no business relations, and the higher prices he may be compelled to pay to the limited number of producers with whom the consumer is now in direct contact through the mails.

Possible revenues based upon the establishment of one route 100 miles long, carrying 1 ton, or 2,000 pounds, of produce per day.

2,000 pounds at parcel-post rate (about one-half cent per pound), \$10 for 313 days a year.....\$3,130.00

Operating cost of one-half ton:

Vehicle to convey one-half ton each way, 50

miles.....\$1,740.15

Salary of employee.....1,200.00

2,940.15

Profit.....189.85

What will be the overhead charges in connection with each route?

The proportionate cost of supervision, inspection, and indirect expense incident to postal facilities at the point where the service is established, and the services of any agent or employee assigned to duty in connection with the operation of the route. As this can not be definitely fixed until a route is established, it is impossible to state the exact amount.

If it be true that eight parcels move from city to farm to one from the farm to the city, how will this be remedied by putting on more vehicles?

If the number of vehicles be increased, the number of parcels carried will increase, and, whether the ratio be 8 to 1 or some other, the patron will benefit and the revenues of the Postal Service increase in proportion.

Who is responsible to the purchaser for decayed goods?

Perishable articles are transported in the Postal Service at owner's risk.

Will the Government be in the same position as the railroads—responsible for the loss?

No.

How many new employees will be required under the plan?

One per vehicle per route.

Would they be under civil service?

Probably not during the period of the experiment.

What percentage of the road mileage of the country as a whole will be available for this service?

Of the 2,230,000 miles of highway in the United States, about 160,000 miles have been improved, of which 150,000 miles, or 7 per cent of the total mileage of the country, is available, although it is not impracticable to use some fairly good dirt or sand-clay roads not considered as improved in this statement.

Rank.	City. ¹	Gross receipts.
Salary \$8,000:		
1	New York, N. Y.	\$33,621,845
2	Chicago, Ill. (2)	27,289,386
3	Philadelphia, Pa.	9,492,089
4	Boston, Mass. (5)	8,952,077
5	St. Louis, Mo. (16)	8,719,944
Salary \$6,000:		
6	Pittsburgh, Pa. (6)	4,330,125
7	Detroit, Mich. (3)	4,011,411
8	Cleveland, Ohio (3)	3,961,309
9	Brooklyn, N. Y.	3,954,865
10	San Francisco, Cal.	3,617,948
11	Kansas City, Mo. (4)	3,582,388
12	Cincinnati, Ohio (17)	3,163,989
13	Minneapolis, Minn. (4)	3,120,251
14	Baltimore, Md. (10)	2,992,676
15	Buffalo, N. Y. (2)	2,748,700
16	Los Angeles, Cal.	2,437,555
17	Milwaukee, Wis. (6)	2,173,214
18	Washington, D. C. (11)	2,140,222
19	St. Paul, Minn. (3)	1,964,415
20	Indianapolis, Ind. (13)	1,820,700
21	Omaha, Nebr. (7)	1,691,211
22	Newark, N. J.	1,644,504
23	Denver, Colo. (5)	1,601,045
24	Seattle, Wash. (7)	1,563,177
25	Atlanta, Ga. (6)	1,545,165
26	New Orleans, La. (2)	1,425,403
27	Rochester, N. Y. (4)	1,394,325
28	Louisville, Ky. (4)	1,349,999
29	Dallas, Tex. (11)	1,338,817
30	Des Moines, Iowa (7)	1,308,470
31	Columbus, Ohio (8)	1,303,803
32	Portland, Oreg. (3)	1,220,474
33	Toledo, Ohio (9)	1,137,578
34	Providence, R. I. (1)	1,075,982
35	Richmond, Va. (9)	967,163
36	Memphis, Tenn. (6)	911,825
37	Hartford, Conn. (1)	882,423
38	Nashville, Tenn. (12)	832,898
39	Syracuse, N. Y. (5)	807,218
40	Jersey City, N. J.	793,203
41	Akron, Ohio (6)	773,593
42	Dayton, Ohio (17)	762,465
43	Albany, N. Y. (1)	761,701
44	Springfield, Mass. (2)	761,451
45	New Haven, Conn. (8)	727,765
46	Grand Rapids, Mich. (10)	721,231
47	Jacksonville, Fla. (5)	675,471
48	Salt Lake City, Utah (8)	670,229
49	Houston, Tex. (5)	644,927
50	Worcester, Mass.	632,000
51	Spokane, Wash. (11)	613,818
Salary \$5,000:		
52	Oklahoma, Okla.	594,668
53	Birmingham, Ala.	578,231
54	Oakland, Cal.	561,145
55	Springfield, Ohio	519,115
56	Harrisburg, Pa.	514,844
57	Chattanooga, Tenn.	514,346
58	Lincoln, Nebr.	507,511
59	Scranton, Pa.	505,225
60	San Antonio, Tex.	504,820
61	Bridgeport, Conn.	501,248
62	Peoria, Ill.	501,009

¹ Figures in parentheses indicate rural routes.

EXHIBIT B.

MEMORANDUM FOR THE THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL.

JANUARY 7, 1918.

The Postal Savings System can be made of much greater service by a few statutory changes, which I am confident Congress would promptly authorize as war legislation.

A larger limit on deposits: This would mean more hidden money put to work. Deposits doubled after May 18, 1916, when the limit was raised from \$500 to \$1,000. From July 1, 1916, to June 30, 1917, the net increase was \$46,000,000, as against \$20,000,000 the year before. Old depositors who had been choked by the former limitation were first to increase their savings. Deposits in 1917 went ahead 53 per cent while the gain in individual depositors was only 12 per cent. Thousands of depositors are now up to their interest-bearing limit and want a chance to deposit more.

Congress should be asked to authorize the acceptance of interest-bearing deposits up to \$3,000. It would be unwise, in my judgment, to remove the limit altogether, but sufficient latitude should be given to cover reasonable demands. Noninterest-bearing accounts should not be accepted even if they could be had. Fair dealing with the public requires at least the payment of our present rate of interest on all deposits when 4 per cent money, with equal security, is being eagerly sought by the Government. While preparing this memorandum a letter has been placed on my desk from the postmaster at Albany, Oreg., stating that a depositor at his office who has \$1,000 on deposit wants "to place about two or three thousand more in his name and that of his wife who also has \$1,000 in interest-bearing certificates."

In 1917 the Postal Savings System was run at a profit to the Government of \$955,000. It should be more this year if the service is

broadened to meet the reasonable demands of the public. While the service was not intended as a money-making adjunct of the department, still the case gets stronger when a more efficient service to the public would incidentally bring a larger revenue to the Government.

Postal savings cards: A postal saving card has one stamp embossed on it and spaces are left for adding nine adhesive 10-cent postal savings stamps, so the card when filled has a redemption value of \$1. Postmasters are required, therefore, to keep an account of cards as well as stamps. A card should be gotten up inexpensively and serve merely as a form to which 10 10-cent adhesive postal savings stamps may be added. No record of it would then be necessary and it could be utilized for advertising purposes. But, strange to say, it will require an amendment to the original postal savings act to eliminate the embossed stamp. While this is a small matter in one way, still by making the cards nonaccountable stock much printing and accounting expense would be done away with.

EXHIBIT C.

FEBRUARY 13, 1918.

Additional cost, fiscal year 1919, if the provisions of H. R. 944, introduced by Judge Moon by direction of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, are enacted into law.

Reclassification: Entrance salary \$1,000 instead of \$800, as at present. Automatic promotions to \$1,500:

Clerks, first and second class offices \$3,351,000
City letter carriers 3,303,125

15 per cent increase to assistant postmasters, \$1,200 and below 433,950

10 per cent increase to assistant postmasters, \$1,800 to \$1,800, inclusive 259,875

Watchmen, messengers, and laborers 9,270

Printers, mechanics, skilled laborers 65,525

Motor vehicle service employees 428,700

Substitute clerks 555,700

Additional cost account compensation of 100 per cent on first \$100 cancellation to fourth-class postmasters instead of 100 per cent on first \$50, as now provided 1,900,000

15 per cent increase to clerical employees at third-class offices 300,000

15 per cent increase to persons employed under separating allowances 109,500

15 per cent increase to persons employed under cleaning allowances (first and second class offices, janitor service) 30,000

For railway mail clerks 4,562,800

For rural carriers 10,300,000

For post office inspectors 45,750

Total cost fiscal year 1919 25,686,195

Total cost fiscal year 1920 36,912,795

Total cost fiscal year 1921 48,338,795

Total additional cost for first three years 110,937,785

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] has used 55 minutes. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] is recognized for one hour and a half.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this bill is not very systematic. It is not drawn to scale. It is like a great many other legislative propositions—the result of compromises in the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and, of course, it seems to me that in the eyes of some it is rather subject to criticism.

The first part of the bill, which relates to the compensation of rural carriers, I think originated very largely in a bill that I introduced, although I am aware of the fact that about 150 other gentlemen, Members of the House, introduced similar bills. Anyway, the subcommittee that prepared the bill considered, out of courtesy to me as a member of it, the bill which I introduced, which provided for equipment allowances for rural carriers. But the majority of the whole committee concluded that there should be an increase in compensation. They did not agree to the idea of having equipment allowances, and so we find here that the compensation of rural carriers who receive not to exceed \$1,200—that is to say, those carriers who have a route not exceeding the standard route—shall have an increased compensation of 15 per cent, or \$180.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. Can the gentleman tell me whether anything is allowed the rural carrier for the upkeep of his equipment or the feed of his horses?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will tell you. He is not allowed anything.

Mr. REAVIS. What is the city carrier allowed?

Mr. STEENERSON. My recollection is that he is allowed something, I think either \$300 or \$400 or maybe \$500. I do not remember the exact figures.

Mr. REAVIS. Can the gentleman give any good reason why the carrier in the city should be allowed \$300 or \$400 or \$500 for upkeep of equipment while the rural carrier is allowed nothing?

Mr. STEENERSON. Reasons were given. They were not my reasons. But reasons were given by the department officials.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Are you talking about mounted or unmounted carriers?

Mr. REAVIS. Mounted carriers.

Mr. STEENERSON. There are carriers who are mounted, not on horseback, but there are carriers who have vehicles. It was stated that the expense of maintaining an automobile in a city, or even horses, was higher than in the country.

Mr. REAVIS. In other words, the department believed that an automobile run over a country road would not consume as much gas and oil as an automobile run over the paved streets of a city?

Mr. STEENERSON. I am not going to argue that question with the gentleman. I was simply giving information.

Mr. REAVIS. I am not asking the gentleman's judgment. I am asking whether the department left the impression with the committee that the upkeep of an automobile, run with gas and oil, would be cheaper in the country than in the city, going over country roads rather than city streets?

Mr. STEENERSON. I suppose it would cost less in the country.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. LOBECK. Usually the mounted service furnished in the cities is for the outlying districts, where the streets are not paved.

Mr. STEENERSON. I believe that is right. The gentleman comes from Nebraska, whence the other gentleman comes.

Mr. LOBECK. I have no objection to what the gentleman from Nebraska says, although he was intending to show by his remarks that the streets of the cities were all paved.

Mr. STEENERSON. Now, with regard to this compensation, in addition to the \$180 to be allowed to the ones receiving the maximum, we have provided an additional compensation for every mile over 24 miles. Under the present law a rural carrier may be required—and a great many are required—to carry the mail for more than 24 miles, but they get the maximum, \$1,200, up to 30 miles. A large number of routes in the Northwest are 28 and 30 miles, but the carrier can only get a maximum of \$1,200. There is a law that authorizes the department to make compensation, and which requires it where the route is more than 30 miles, at the rate of \$24 a mile.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Is it not a fact that under the present law the carrier who makes less than 24 miles has his salary reduced to the extent of \$24 per mile per annum?

Mr. STEENERSON. It is reduced; but more than the gentleman suggests.

Mr. SNYDER. Twenty-four dollars per mile per annum.

Mr. STEENERSON. It is reduced more than that.

Mr. SNYDER. That is my understanding.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. The compensation is fixed in the resolution—

Mr. SNYDER. I am speaking of the present rule.

Mr. STEENERSON. I am speaking of the present law. I might as well give it to you now.

Mr. SNYDER. I would like to have it.

Mr. STEENERSON. It was in the joint resolution which continued the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1916. It was passed on March 4, 1915, because the Post Office appropriation bill had failed. It provides that on and after July 1, 1915, the compensation of each letter carrier for serving a rural route of 24 miles and over six days in the week shall be \$1,200 per annum, payable monthly; on routes 22 miles and less than 24 miles, \$1,152; on routes 20 miles and less than 22 miles, \$1,080; on routes 18 miles and less than 20 miles, \$960; on routes 16 miles and less than 18 miles, \$840; on routes 14 miles and less than 16 miles, \$720; on routes 12 miles and less than 14 miles, \$672; on routes 10 miles and less than 12 miles, \$624; on routes 8 miles and less than 10 miles, \$576; on routes 6 miles and less than 8 miles, \$528; on routes 4 miles and less than 6 miles, \$480.

Now, you will observe, if you take those figures, that the difference between these different distances is more than \$24 a mile; it is closer to \$50 a mile on a shorter distance. For instance, the difference between 6 and 8—I had a table prepared, but I have not got it with me now—I think it amounts to about \$58 or \$60, the increase per mile.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I should like to finish my answer first. Then I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

There is another law which I should have quoted in this connection. My recollection is that it is discretionary to allow \$24 a mile between 24 and 30 miles, but I know it is mandatory to allow \$24 a mile where the route exceeds 30 miles. Now, this

proposed bill provides that they shall receive \$24 a mile for the additional miles over 24.

Mr. SNYDER. That is quite correct. What I had in mind was that where a man had been assigned to a route of 24 miles, and thereafter at some time the route was decreased a mile, and did not come into the range of one of the grades that the gentleman has mentioned, then the reduction would be based on \$24 per annum for the mile taken off the route.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman claim that to reduce a 26-mile route to 24 miles would carry such a decrease?

Mr. SNYDER. What I contend is that if a 24-mile route as originally laid out was reduced to 23 miles then the \$24 per mile per annum would apply.

Mr. STEENERSON. I think it is more than that. I think the reduction is more.

Mr. SNYDER. It is that much, anyhow.

Mr. STEENERSON. Because you know that \$1,200 for 24 miles, which is the standard route, is \$50 a mile. Now, if you reduce that 2 miles, or reduce the 24 miles to 22 miles, the rate for the 22 miles is \$1,152. That is a reduction of \$48.

Mr. SNYDER. That is what I contend—\$24 a mile. If it is reduced 2 miles, and the reduction in salary is \$48, that is \$24 a mile, just exactly what the gentleman says.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; it would be \$48 less for the 2 miles. That is correct. Now I want to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL], who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. DOWELL. Getting back to the question submitted by the gentleman from Nebraska, is it not true that since the routes have been extended by the department, in the last year or so, it is necessary for the rural carrier not only to equip and keep an automobile but also to keep horses and wagons to deliver the mail at times when the automobile can not be used, which is usually several months of the year in many of the districts?

Mr. STEENERSON. In the latitude where I live he not only has got to keep a horse and wagon but a span of horses and a sleigh, because in the winter months the road is not suitable for one horse.

Mr. DOWELL. Does not that necessarily double his expense by way of equipment and upkeep, since the expansion of these routes?

Mr. STEENERSON. That would seem to be obvious.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Along the line of the inquiry of the gentleman from Nebraska, when the gentleman explained the pay of the rural carrier, will the gentleman now please tell us how much the city carrier gets and how his compensation is fixed? The rural carrier seems to have his compensation fixed by mileage, and the upkeep of the city carrier and his pay must necessarily be fixed in some other way. How much does he get? Is it as much as the rural carrier gets, or more?

Mr. STEENERSON. He gets more.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Why is that?

Mr. STEENERSON. I think they pay him more now because the law requires it.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. I desire to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question which I think will bring out a defect in the bill as it is now reported.

Mr. STEENERSON. Very well.

Mr. DENISON. The bill now provides for an increase of 15 per cent on salaries up to and including \$1,200?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. And \$24 a mile for all miles over 24 miles?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Say that a carrier is now delivering mail over a route 31 miles long. His salary is \$1,224 a year.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. And he will not get the benefit of the 15 per cent increase. His salary under this bill would amount to \$1,368; that is, \$1,200, and \$24 per mile for 7 miles.

Mr. STEENERSON. If that interpretation is correct, why, yes.

Mr. DENISON. It is bound to be correct.

Mr. STEENERSON. Up to \$1,200 they get the 15 per cent increase.

Mr. DENISON. But he is now making \$1,224 for traveling 31 miles; so his salary under this bill will amount to \$1,368, whereas the man who has a route only 30 miles long now will get the 15 per cent increase and \$24 per mile for 6 miles, or \$1,524 under this bill; so a man traveling only 30 miles will get under

this bill \$1,524 while the man traveling 31 miles will get \$1,368.

Mr. STEENERSON. The language is 15 per cent increase up to and including those who receive \$1,200.

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. The case the gentleman has in mind is that of a man who receives more than \$1,200. He is not within that description.

Mr. DENISON. The case I have in mind is the case of a man whose route is 31 miles who gets a salary now of \$1,224, so he would not get the 15 per cent increase.

Mr. PLATT. Why would he not get the additional \$24 per mile for the miles between 24 and 30?

Mr. DENISON. He would undoubtedly get that.

Mr. ROBBINS. He would get that under this bill.

Mr. STEENERSON. But the gentleman's contention is that he would not get the 15 per cent.

Mr. PLATT. No; he would perhaps not get the 15 per cent, because his salary is \$1,224. I am not quite sure how that would be interpreted, but he would get six times \$24 for the extra mileage up to 30 miles.

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. That will give him \$1,368, if my figures are right.

Mr. DENISON. The man who now travels 30 miles gets \$1,200, while the man who travels 31 miles gets \$24 for that additional mile, or \$1,224. Now, the man who travels 24 miles and gets \$1,200 will get the benefit of the 15 per cent increase, and the man who travels 31 miles will not get the benefit of it.

Mr. PLATT. But he will get the \$144.

Mr. DENISON. Whereas the man who travels 31 miles will get \$1,368.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman from Illinois has pointed out a possible interpretation of the language which, if it bears that construction, will deserve consideration and ought to be corrected before we get through with the bill.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. They have been revising rural routes all over the country and increasing the length of them from 24 to 30 miles, or nearly that. By doing that they have saved the immense sum of \$1,500 in one of my counties. If you are going to give \$24 increased pay for every mile a man travels between 24 miles and 29 miles, where is the profit going to be in the lengthening of the routes?

Mr. STEENERSON. That is one reason why we thought we would make it so that would not be done. As is provided now, a man will travel 30 miles without extra pay, and the object was to stop that.

I might say that this matter of decrease is, of course, a matter of administration. Of course we can not compel the administration to do things that we would like to. We can make general rules. The administration of the rural service has been the cause of a great deal of complaint. I have received marked copies of newspapers containing complaints from the gentleman's own State, the western part of New York, where they have abandoned the rural free-delivery routes because nobody could carry the mail, and they have had to perform the service by star route. But, of course, it is impossible to prevent poor administration where they persist in it.

Mr. PLATT. Under the present arrangement if they lengthen 10 routes that are now 24 miles in length to 29 miles in length they save the salary of one man, which is \$1,200. Every time they lengthen a route they save 5 miles. In 10 routes they can drop a route out, but with this provision in that inducement is taken away, as it should be, because it makes many of the routes too long for good service.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I should like to ask the gentleman about the application of section 3 of the act approved March 3, 1917, making appropriations for the Post Office Department, increasing the salaries of \$480 and less, 15 per cent; over \$480 up to \$800, 10 per cent, to this bill?

Mr. STEENERSON. I think the gentleman had better discuss that in his own time.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I want the gentleman's opinion on it.

Mr. STEENERSON. I am not prepared to give any opinion.

Mr. RAMSEYER. If a carrier now gets 15 per cent on his \$480 salary, does he under this bill get 15 per cent on the \$480 plus the \$72?

Mr. STEENERSON. I guess he would not; I do not think he would be given that unless we stretch the law a good ways.

Mr. RAMSEYER. We are proposing to legislate, and I think we ought to know about it.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will say that it is a negligible question, because there are so few of those that it does not amount to anything. There would not be more than two or three hundred in the United States of these \$480 men.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The act I referred to includes all those who get between \$480 and \$720. I do not object to the increase, but I want to know just what increase they are to receive under this bill.

Mr. STEENERSON. There are very few, and the question has never occurred to me, and so I am not prepared to discuss it. If there is anything in it, I hope the gentleman will offer an amendment to correct it.

Now, in regard to the administration of the Postal Service, as I have said to the gentleman from New York, we can only give a general rule. I know that there are more complaints to-day about the Postal Service, about the service we are getting, than ever before. I have never known so much dissatisfaction expressed by the public as with the service that they are now getting. I want to take this occasion to say, too, that although I have been very closely studying the postal service for the last 15 years I have been in Congress, I believe that the complaints that have come in can in no way be founded upon any lack of efficiency or fidelity on the part of employees. I want to repeat what I have said often, that the postal employees, from the highest to the lowest, are a very faithful, honest, and effective corps of men. They are trying to do everything possible in the very best way, but it is a fact that few people realize that their burdens have been greatly increased in recent years. We have in the last few years practically gone into a new line of business, that of freight transportation. Why, the last time that I got any statistics, which is about a year ago, the amount of parcels exceeded a billion, and the average was 1 pound and 11 ounces, or practically 2 pounds, making more than 2,000,000,000 pounds of that class of mail, which is really package freight. It is all thrown on the carriers.

The rural carriers especially are loaded down with these things. We have added to their duties in various other ways. The postal savings law and the money orders have been extended so that the work of the postal employees has been increased. The Railway Mail Service has perhaps been the greatest sufferer from the overloading, so to speak. I read in the Star night before last a reference to the delay in the first-class mail between Washington and New York. I heard a distinguished Senator from Illinois say that it took 12 days now to get a letter from Chicago to his office. The explanation given last night in the Star by Second Assistant Postmaster General Praeger was that it sometimes took a day and a half, according to the stamp on the envelope, for a letter to get to the railway mail clerk.

The clippings are as follows:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 20, 1918.]

TO AVOID THE DELAY IN MAIL DELIVERIES LOCAL BUSINESS MEN USE SPECIAL STAMPS ON LETTERS ADDRESSED TO NEW YORK.

Washington banks, department stores, and other mercantile houses are resorting to the use of special-delivery stamps in order to insure quick delivery of letters in New York.

While Washington business men are not disposed to be too hard on the mail service, there is a general feeling that somewhere between here and New York, both coming and going, something is slowing up tremendously the delivery of letters.

"All of our important mail is now being sent by special delivery," the president of one of the city's largest banks declared to-day. "We started the use of the special delivery stamps on our ordinary mail recently in order to be sure that it was delivered in New York on the first delivery."

"This is the only way we can be sure of such early delivery now," he continued. Other institutions have adopted the same practice here.

SUSPECT CAUSE OF DELAY.

It is generally believed by business men that the Railway Mail Service is responsible for the slowing up in mail facilities between here and New York.

Letters mailed in New York after business hours formerly were delivered in Washington on the first mail to the business sections of the city next morning.

To-day such letters are scattered over the various deliveries of the day.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 20, 1918.]

PRAEGER DEFENDS RAIL MAIL SERVICE—DECLARES WAR AND PARCEL POST FLOOD POST OFFICES, CAUSING DELAY—TEST FOR BUSINESS MEN.

Denial that the Railway Mail Service is to blame for any delay in the delivery of letters between here and New York was made to-day by Otto Praeger, Second Assistant Postmaster General, and officials of the Railway Mail Service.

While specifically pointing out that no blame must be attached either to the Washington or the New York City post office, owing to the tremendous difficulties they are laboring under as the result of war con-

ditions, Mr. Praeger declared that the records of the Railway Mail Service show that the Washington city post office has recently turned over to the Railway Mail Service letters 26 hours after they were postmarked.

These particular letters were addressed to points south. The records will show, it was declared, that certain letters bound north, postmarked here 10 a. m., were not delivered to the Railway Mail Service until 3 p. m. that afternoon, in the meantime two or three other trains to New York having left the Union Station. In one instance 200 letters addressed to New York business houses were involved.

MAIL SWAMPS OFFICES.

No blame, however, is attached to the Washington city post office by the Post Office Department. The great volume of war mail and the tremendous growth of the parcel post has literally swamped more than one city post office in the country.

The Washington city post office is hit worst of all owing to the fact that this city is the origin of tons and tons of war literature issued by the Government.

The local post office, also, is short handed on account of many men having gone with the colors. For these reasons Post Office Department officials believe that the people of Washington should be lenient over any delay that may arise, either now or in the future, in the transportation and delivery of letters going to and from between here and New York.

Three truck loads of Easter hats, mailed from a St. Louis firm to various small towns in Virginia and Maryland, are instanced by officials as a sample of what the Washington city post office, the Railway Mail Service, and the entire Post Office Department are up against at this time.

RAIL CLERKS INCREASED.

The Railway Mail Service, it was stated, has increased the number of men who "work" the Washington mail on the trains from New York. No men have been taken off, it is asserted. The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad recently removed a train which left here at 2:30 o'clock each morning. This added to the difficulties confronting the service.

Another thing which is causing delay of letters sent to New York is the fact that local carriers, in collecting mail late at night, miss getting letters on the Pennsylvania train leaving Washington daily at 12:10 a. m. Letters that miss this train must wait until 7:25 a. m.

New York is having her troubles with the mails, too. Records of the Railway Mail Service will show that letters have been sent from New York to Washington on the Pennsylvania train No. 109, leaving New York at 8 a. m. which were postmarked 2 o'clock, 6 o'clock, and 9 o'clock p. m. the evening before. This train is due to arrive in Washington at 1:45 o'clock p. m. If it arrives late there is little wonder that letters do not get delivered here the same day, it is declared.

WALL STREET MAIL SUFFERS.

Many of the letters involved were letters mailed from the Wall Street district.

Further, in the instance in question the train was late and the letters could not be delivered in Washington that day, and the next day was Washington's Birthday, so it was still another day before the letters were delivered.

The use of special-delivery stamps can in no way accelerate the transportation of letters in so far as the Railway Mail Service is concerned, Mr. Praeger pointed out. Washington banks, department stores, and other business establishments have recently resorted to the use of the special-delivery stamps to make sure of immediate delivery in New York of important letters.

"The special-delivery stamp has no effect on the Railway Mail Service," Mr. Praeger said.

"The only function and purpose of the special-delivery stamp is to expedite the delivery of a letter by the city post office."

TEST FOR BUSINESS MEN.

Railway Mail Service officials suggested that business men test the truth of this statement by a novel test, as follows:

Take the original letter and mail it at the city post office. Then take a carbon copy of the letter, carry it to the mail box on the "fence" guarding the train gates and drop the letter in that box. Collections are made from this box up until 10 or 15 minutes before the mail trains leave the station.

Officials expressed the hope, however, that business men would not take to mailing their New York letters by means of the Union Station letter box on the fence, as this would practically transfer the city post office to the concourse of the Union Station.

Trains containing railway post offices leave Washington for New York, as follows: 12:10 a. m., 7:25 a. m., 9 a. m., 11 a. m., 3 p. m., 7 p. m., and 10:40 p. m.

In addition to these regular mail trains there are express trains which may be caught by the mails. If a letter is so lucky as to hit one of these trains, it may get to New York in surprisingly quick time, even these days.

The headlines of the article, and the substance of it bears them out, were to the effect that the Assistant Postmaster General blames the parcel post for the delay in the first-class mail, and I believe he has the right idea. I think the cause is there. We have undertaken to do a large package-freight business, constantly increasing the size of the package and decreasing the rate at which it shall be carried within certain zones, so that the work of carrying freight has interfered with the work of carrying the first-class mail. I am as good a friend of parcel post as anyone in the House, yet I do not believe that it is the prime object for which the Postal Service was created. The law gives to the United States a monopoly on carrying first-class mail. No one can carry a letter for pay without incurring the penalty of fine or imprisonment, for we forbid anyone except the United States doing it. So far as parcels or packages are concerned, however, the carrying of them is free. Anybody can undertake that business. That argues to my mind that we owe a higher duty to the first-class mail than we do to this other business, because the field is open to everyone to engage in it. Besides that the rate of compensation, as indicated by the postage re-

quired, is so much higher as to make that the most profitable branch of the service; and if it be true, as indicated in the interview with the Second Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Praeger, that the parcel post has interfered with and delayed the first-class mail, I say it is deplorable and it is a mistake. It seems to me there ought to be a separate department, the same as they have in England, if we are going to carry on that large business.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Could not they give sufficient help to put out this first-class mail before the parcel post is taken care of as freight?

Mr. STEENERSON. They are doing their best; but the fact is, as Mr. Praeger says, that the delay that occurs in the first-class mail is attributable to the parcel post.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does he not say anything with regard to the lack of help?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; although I believe that is one cause. It was charged before the committee that the Railway Mail Service is crippled because they have discharged 1,200 mail clerks, but he defended that and explained that that did not occasion any delay; that these separations formerly made on the railway post-office cars were now made in the terminals. I think that does not wholly justify us in saying that the reduction in the number of railway mail clerks has not caused some delay; but the opinion of the official who has direct charge of the transportation of the mails by the railroads is entitled to some consideration, and he says in an interview that the first-class mail delay is caused, to some extent, by the overloading of the mails by the parcel post. The load exceeds the capacity of the equipment and facilities.

Mr. EMERSON. Is it not a fact that the service is crippled a great deal because many of the Government employees are quitting the service to get higher pay?

Mr. STEENERSON. Perhaps they are, but I have not discovered that to be the case. The gentleman may have discovered it; but the First Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Koons, was examined before the committee on that very subject, and he introduced statistics showing that the resignations were about the same—very slightly greater—than in prior years, so that I do not think that that is a material cause.

Mr. E. J. Ryan, of the Railway Association, who is keeping close watch on the service, comes out with this statement, also published in the Star:

SAYS MAIL DELAY IS GENERAL CONDITION—E. J. RYAN, OF RAILWAY ASSOCIATION, GIVES THREE REASONS FOR CONGESTION.

That the delay in mails is not only between Washington and New York, but general throughout the country, is stated to-day by E. J. Ryan, president of the Railway Mail Association, who gives the following reasons:

First. The mails are worked in terminals rather than on the trains while en route.

Second. In practicing false economy, he says, the Post Office Department has instituted a method of cutting down railway mail space on the trains and employing a smaller force to work on the trains.

Third. Trained men are being put on the surplus list, while inexperienced men, at lower salaries, are being taken into the service without regard for civil service.

Mr. Ryan said that he can support these statements with specific instances, which have already been brought to the attention of the post-office authorities. In explaining the situation from the viewpoint of the railway mail association, he said:

"The statement that the delay of mails is only between New York and Washington is an error, as reports show that mails are being delayed practically throughout the entire service. Delayed mails exist on lines not so congested as the railroads operating on the Atlantic seaboard. The fact is that the policy of curtailing space for distributing mails en route in the railroad mail cars, and also reductions in the number of railway postal clerks, who performed this very important work of the Postal Service, is the real cause for the present situation. The war is not to blame."

"POLICY HAS BEEN ADOPTED."

"This policy has been adopted and was actually in effect for months before this country entered the struggle and before the abnormal demands arose which now burden the transportation system. Even now there should be but very little, if any, delay in mails upon their arrival in Washington. Mail cars are attached to passenger trains, not to freight trains. Frequent regular train service exists between New York and Washington."

"Six trains with mail cars arrive in Washington each day from New York. Twelve trains carrying mails in closed pouches, but without mail cars or clerks, arrive each day from New York. Eight trains carrying mail, mail cars, and clerks leave Washington each day for New York, and also eight trains carrying closed pouches without mail cars or clerks."

I shall not now speak of the clerks' and carriers' salaries in city-delivery offices, because that is a subject which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will discuss, and he can give us the information. He has made a study of it. I shall not trespass upon that part of the subject.

There is one remarkable thing about the bill as it now comes to us under this rule, and the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has discussed it, and that is this matter of motor-truck service. The bill was before the Post Office Committee and was favorably reported, although

I was opposed to it and made a minority report, which I want all of the Members to see. It is a part of the same pamphlet that contains the majority report. The thing I want to impress upon your mind especially is this: You hear every once in a while some eloquent Member of Congress of long service and experience say that the House of Representatives ought to be careful of its own dignity and its rights, that we must not yield to encroachments upon our prerogatives. Here is a bill that is remarkable in this respect. It is an appropriation bill—not a regular annual appropriation bill, but a special appropriation bill—originating in the Senate. It comes over to the House and against my protest was reported and put on the calendar, and now comes in by special rule with the unanimous report of the Committee on Rules. Ever since Congress was organized under the Constitution it has been contended in our behalf that appropriation bills come within the scope of the constitutional provision that provides that revenue bills shall originate in the House. Of course, an appropriation bill is not a revenue bill; it is a thing that follows a revenue bill, for if you appropriate you must impose revenue laws. So the practice grew up that all regular appropriation bills originated in the House. Of course, if you construe the Constitution strictly, it may be said that these could originate just as well in the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the gentleman say that he made a report in this case?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. FARR. It is Report No. 159?

Mr. STEENERSON. On Senate bill 2718. There is a Senate report and a House report and a minority report by myself. This is not very important in itself, but if the Senate is going to establish a precedent to make special appropriation bills and send them over here without objection, then you have laid the path open to have regular appropriation bills come over from that end of the Capitol.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. MOON. I observe the gentleman discussing the action of the Senate in making an appropriation. This is not a Senate bill.

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, yes, it is; it is a Senate bill.

Mr. MOON. Just a part of this bill is a Senate bill.

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, that is simply camouflage. It is the first time that I have used the word, but I will get used to it after a while.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman shows that he does not know what it means.

Mr. STEENERSON. The Senate bill is word for word what is in this rule, and there is no concealment of that fact, and we are thereby laying a foundation for the Senate to make special appropriation bills and send them over here for us to pass upon afterwards, thus violating the spirit of the Constitution, as I contend and as I have stated in my minority report. If you allow that, the next thing will be for them to originate all appropriation bills, and the House of Representatives, elected by the people, will be playing a very insignificant rôle. Now, what is the use of coming in here every once in a while talking about the dignity of the House and that we must vindicate our rights, that we must not act as registers of the will of the other end of the Capitol, and all that sort of thing.

Mr. BOWERS. Be rubber stamps.

Mr. STEENERSON. And then come right down on your elbows and your knees and abandon to the Senate—

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. And abandon a practice that was condemned by so great a man as William H. Seward, of New York. I cited him here. He made a very able report in the Thirty-fourth Congress on this very subject.

Mr. MOON. I just want to remind my colleague on the committee that the House bill on this subject of motor trucks is No. 5640 and that the Senate bill is 2718, and we amended the Senate bill and added the aviation feature to it, so, as a matter of fact, the bill 2718 is the product of the House exclusively.

Mr. STEENERSON. It is the same thing the gentleman stated once before, that he contends it is not the Senate bill because they have embodied it in this rule, but the bill is on the calendar, reported to the House, and, as I say, I have a minority report right here. But aside from that here we have then a bill to provide for a motor-truck service for certain cities. The object, they say, is to cheapen the cost of living. I point out in my minority report that it appears from the testimony of Mr. Praeger and Mr. Blakslee, and from the Senate report on a similar bill, that eight parcels travel from the city to the farm to one parcel traveling from the farm to the city. Now, the

object, they say, is to increase the number of parcels coming from the farm to the city and therefore they want to increase the number of vehicles. Now, there are seven empty vehicles to one loaded one traveling from the farm to the city. Now, if they can make 12 empty vehicles and 1 loaded one they think it will have a tendency to increase the amount of transportation or the amount of freight from the farm to the city by these means. In these times when we are taxing ourselves very heavily it seems to me gross extravagance to appropriate \$300,000, nearly \$1,000 a day for every working day in the year, in order to enable the Postmaster General to make this experiment when the Second Assistant Postmaster General comes out in the public press and says that first-class mail is now delayed by reason of the large quantity of parcels that have been thrown upon the mail service since the war began. We are overloaded with freight parcels now and, therefore, they say they want to encourage new transportation from the farm by having them ship cabbages, chickens, and so forth.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. PLATT. The gentleman has referred to the appropriation for motor vehicles.

Mr. STEENERSON. That is embodied in this rule.

Mr. PLATT. As I understand, and I have had some talk with the Post Office Department on this very matter, the routes already established have been great successes, far more so in that they have developed the business that does not go on rural routes.

Mr. STEENERSON. If they have experimented and know it is a success, what is the use of asking \$300,000 for an experiment?

Mr. PLATT. They have not enough money to establish any great number of them up to this time; but their claim is—I talked the matter over with the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General—that up to the present these routes very much more than pay for themselves and they can be established as a commercial proposition.

Mr. STEENERSON. The Second Assistant Postmaster General, like many other departmental officers, is gifted with a vivid imagination.

Mr. PLATT. The Fourth Assistant.

Mr. STEENERSON. The Fourth Assistant, Mr. Blakslee, has an imagination that is second to none in the Government service. Now, that illustrates how they figure it out. Do you suppose you will ever get through with increase in the cost of these experiments? I do not. What is the experience in regard to the parcel post generally? There is a pamphlet on my table of evidence taken before the Senate committee which shows the manner in which they figure out the profit on the parcel post. Is the gentleman familiar with that?

Mr. PLATT. No.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does the gentleman know they figure out two-thirds, if not three-fourths, of the parcels were delivered without extra cost to the Government? They never allowed a cent for the parcels which were delivered to the cities where they had the carriers. They only put on a little extra where they had special carriers or special conveyances for the parcels. Because most of the packages were delivered by regular carriers and vehicles they figured that these were delivered "without extra cost" to the Government.

They are just like a railroad manager who would say, "I carry 10 passengers in a car, and I can just as well carry 40 more for nothing, because it does not cost anything." Now, that is the way they figure out that the Parcel Post Service is profitable. They loaded it on the carriers and said it cost nothing. They will figure out, no doubt, that this experiment in carrying farm products to the city will be profitable. If so, it is not necessary to appropriate this money, because they have already made the experiment.

Mr. PLATT. If the gentleman will permit, while I agree with him as to the figures they have already submitted as to the parcel-post profits, in general you can take a mail route extending 50 miles or 100 miles, running back and forth, and keep books on that route and tell whether it pays or not. It seems to me that ought to be a simple thing as compared with the whole.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman may explain that in his own time. I do not believe they will keep correct figures. This is a pet scheme of their own, and they want to expend \$300,000 on it; and they will come in to prove that it did not cost hardly anything to do it and that it will cheapen the cost of living. They have been engaged in cheapening the cost of living for the last four or five or six years, and if they keep on cheapening it as they have in the last five or six years I do not know

where we are going to get the money to pay for it. A few more such victories over high prices and we are undone.

It can be proven that the cost of living to the farmer to-day has been doubled. A few years ago, before this great reform was inaugurated, a farmer could go to the mill and get his wheat ground for a toll of 1 peck on a 2-bushel sack. I am old enough to remember when in southern Minnesota I used to take from the farm a load of wheat to the mill, and the miller would come with his toll dish of a peck and take a peck out of each bag. That is 12½ per cent to transform it into flour. How much does he get under this administration? A farmer gets back about 60 per cent. He pays 40 per cent to the middleman.

That is the way they have cheapened the cost of living to the farmer, and if you keep on with these experiments, piling up taxes at the rate of \$300,000 a year, \$1,000 a day for this experiment, and keep on transferring all activities to some Government agency that wants higher salaries like these rural carriers and all the clerks—and they need it—the result will be that you will increase the cost of living and increase the profit of the middleman, whether he be a Government agent or a private citizen.

Now, in conclusion, I do not care whether you pass that bill or not, but I feel it my duty to point out to you what it is. It is absolutely necessary, if we are going to maintain the Postal Service, both in the cities and in the country, that these salaries or compensations should be increased, and for that reason I am in favor of them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROUSE].

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Chairman, on the 12th day of this month a great patriotic mass meeting was held in Covington, Ky., where certain resolutions were adopted, that were addressed to the President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives, and in my time, and in order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to print the resolutions referred to in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolutions are as follows:

I, Stephens L. Blakely, do hereby certify that I am Commonwealth attorney for the sixteenth judicial district of Kentucky and that I presided as chairman at a mass meeting of the citizens of Kenton County held in Covington on the 12th day of March, 1918; that the opening prayer was made by the Rev. T. J. McCaffrey, a Catholic clergyman; and that benediction was pronounced by the Rev. Joseph W. Hagin, a Christian minister; that Rev. I. Cochrane Hunt, a Presbyterian minister; the Hon. Edward O'Hara; Rabbi David Philipson, of the Rockdale Avenue Temple, of Cincinnati, Ohio; the Rev. John F. Hickey, a clergyman; and the Hon. John B. O'Neal addressed the mass meeting on the subject presented in the accompanying resolution. That the accompanying resolution was prepared and read by the Hon. John B. O'Neal and then unanimously adopted.

I further certify that there were present at said meeting about 2,000 reputable citizens of Kenton County, and that there were, according to my information and belief, about 1,000 persons who were unable to enter the hall and who held a mass meeting on the streets outside the hall; that the meeting was called for the expressed purpose of presenting this resolution, and that it is my information and belief that those persons outside the hall favored the adoption of this resolution.

STEPHENS L. BLAKELY,
Commonwealth Attorney, Sixteenth Judicial District.

Subscribed and sworn to before me by Stephens L. Blakely, this the 16th day of March, 1918.

[SEAL.]

A. B. WALKER,
Notary Public, Kenton County, Ky.

To the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives of the United States of America:

We, the people of Kenton County, Ky., brought together by an awakened sense of the dangers which threaten this Nation, and by the earnest desire of doing what we may to avert those dangers, solemnly declare our unflinching loyalty and devotion to our country and our unshaken confidence in the ultimate triumph of freedom and righteousness in this war.

We are deeply sensible of the magnitude of the task imposed upon this Government by the state of unpreparedness in which we were found by an enemy which was prepared at every point, and for the manner in which that great task has been undertaken we feel and express a profound appreciation.

That in the face of imminent dangers we were totally unprepared for defense was a national folly, but a calamity not without its uses, if we learn from it that the American people may not with safety to their institutions, their lives, and their honor sleep in the face of peril, be indifferent to every warning, rely upon a fancied isolation, and fatuously take to their bosoms reptiles whose purpose it is to sting, and whose stings are deadly.

We know at last that this Nation has enlisted in a life and death struggle for freedom against oppression, for civilization against a barbarism which science has made only more brutal; that we are not fighting for the abstract principle of democracy alone, but are fighting in our own defense.

We owe to our heroic allies, who have protected us while we slept, aid and cooperation without measure; we know that the awakened might of the American people thrown into this fight will be of in-

calculable benefit to the cause of humanity, but we can no longer blind ourselves to the truth that we are fighting in defense of our freedom, our homes, our wives, and our children; and we believe it to be the duty of this Government to impress this vital truth upon all Americans who do not already know it.

In the light of the world's dearly bought knowledge of German treachery in peace and German brutality in war, we hold that the safety and happiness of this and future generations demand that this war shall be relentlessly prosecuted to the end; that "peace without victory" would mean a mere truce, to be employed by a ruthless foe, secretly active, in the practice of every device of treachery and corruption.

And in the light of our knowledge of the scope of the German scheme of world supremacy, we believe that it would be folly to doubt that at the end of such a truce we should be fighting for our lives against a Germany as cunning, as brutal, as mad with the lust of power, as is the Germany to-day, but a Germany refreshed and strengthened through German commercial policy and diplomatic villainy.

And we regard it as a self-evident truth that "peace without indemnities" means simply the leaving of the loot in the hands of the thief; that such a truce would mean that in a little while the defenders of the rights of mankind would be fighting again, but under the handicap of exhausted resources and unproductive territories, while brutal Germany attacked with the added power derived from stolen resources and even stolen men.

The purpose of Germany to dominate the world will be merely halted for a short while unless German power is destroyed in this war.

We believe that a free, intelligent, and brave people may well be trusted with the knowledge of all conditions of vital concern to their lives and liberties, and that an unwillingness to alarm loyal citizens, or to give offense to such as are not loyal, be their proportion great or small, has at this time no place in a sound policy.

We believe that every condition which is a menace to us at home or abroad should be frankly recognized and sternly dealt with, and we are completely persuaded that when this is done the certain result will be an aroused and determined people, inspired by just indignation and undaunted in the face of known dangers, a people ready to make any sacrifice to win this war, a people which, knowing what it must do, will do it without fear or question.

Of the vital truths to which we have too long turned an indifferent ear, and to which our safety demands that we be keenly alive, the conditions existing among our so-called German-Americans is perhaps the most important.

We believe and declare as the truth that of our millions of citizens of German extraction many are true and loyal Americans, justly entitled to all honor and to full fellowship with American patriots.

We know that it is equally true that others have not understood or sought to understand American institutions; that they are content to live and thrive among us, caring nothing for our trials and dangers, reading German, thinking German, revering all things German, out of sympathy with us, and in this time of need helping us grudgingly or not at all, forming at all times a fruitful soil for the sowing of the infamous lies of the German propaganda; sullenly quiet now, but potentially dangerous in the event of disaster to our arms, an alien crew richly deserving at all times social and commercial ostracism at the hands of all true Americans.

A third element is actively doing the work of Germany in America.

The fact that we have shared with them without stint all the privileges of American citizenship has not prevented them from spreading the German propaganda, organizing treasonable associations, preaching sedition, and acting as spies, incendiaries, and dynamiters. Prating of freedom of speech, while they speak of treason, they move among us freely, and do us deadly harm while as American citizens they invoke the protection of our laws.

It has at last been forced upon our knowledge that in common with the rest of the world we have for many years been subjected to the sinister workings of an institution infinitely evil, made up of the German spy system and the German propaganda.

We know that the agents and instruments of this foul scheme, unexampled in all the history of national or individual villainy, whether those agents are German ambassadors or German-Americans, are the miners and sappers, the vanguard of a brutal German soldiery.

We know that while we have been blind to the perils within our very homes—while we have welcomed all who came among us, and shared with them all the blessings of our free institutions—this unspeakable iniquity, the vilest enterprise ever conceived by a perverted and criminal intelligence, has labored ceaselessly among us to compass our destruction.

And we know that it labors among us now, with an ever-increasing boldness.

We feel that at this late day there is no need to describe this monstrous tissue of corruption, further than to say that it is a fit instrument for the furtherance of Germany's cruel and crafty scheme of world domination—that so widespread and various are its destructive activities that its service attracts and embraces criminals and criminal organizations of every grade, while much of its hellish work is done by mere dupes and fools.

We believe that the wise regulations, established for the conservation of food and fuel, are potent and even vital instruments in the development of our defense; we pledge ourselves to the observance of those rules, and urge the enactment of laws which will adequately punish those who willfully violate them.

We hold that the agent of Germany, who plots the destruction of a factory or warehouse with the purpose of destroying munitions or provisions necessary to the support of our troops or of our allies, or who plots the destruction of a ship with its cargo of innocent lives, is a thing unfit to live, and that to extend clemency to such a one simply because the plot has failed is no more wise than it would be to spare a cobra because its first stroke had missed its victim.

We believe that our safety demands the stern suppression of those, traitors and fools alike, who preach the doctrines of pacifism and non-resistance at this time, when we can preserve our liberties and the honor and lives of our women and children only by fighting for them with a united determination to win, and with our full and unhampered power.

We believe that we should no longer postpone a full reckoning with the dangers which assail us at home, and that to bear ourselves leniently toward sedition or treason is to invite disaster.

We have learned enough of German designs and German agents to know that generosity, kindness, and mercy find no echo in the black hearts of German spies, traitors, and murderers—we know that this rule holds good through all that evil crew, from ambassadors to soap-box preachers of sedition, and that when we find them at work among us our safety demands their destruction.

We bespeak for labor now and at all times a just and generous consideration, and a consideration commensurate with the indispensable and tremendous part which honest labor must play in the development and support of our national defense.

We recognize and claim for labor the right to organize for the furtherance of its every legitimate interest, but we denounce as a traitor deserving of death one who at the behest of our enemy or in the furtherance of personal and selfish designs obstructs in any way the great and patriotic work which labor must do for our salvation.

Wherefore, in the name of the millions of loyal American citizens who believe as we believe and in the name of the brave men whom we must sustain while they fight for our homes and our women, we call upon our Government for the enactment of laws which will recognize the truth that they who preach pacifism and nonresistance in this hour are public enemies; that each is more dangerous to our armies than a regiment of British Huns.

For the enactment and merciless enforcement of laws which will recognize the patent truth that they who plan or accomplish the destruction of supplies necessary for the sustaining of American citizens, American soldiers, or America's allies are murderers striking at the heart of a great Nation, for whom the punishment of speedy death is not only just but necessary.

For the enactment and merciless enforcement of laws, which by penalties of life imprisonment at hard labor, or death by hanging, will crush and destroy every form of sedition or treason and wipe out in America the last vestige of that evil thing through which arrogant and brutal Germany strives to pave the way for her armed hordes of robbers, rapists, and murderers.

For the enactment of laws which will make impossible the dissemination of German lies through the medium of German-language newspapers, magazines, and pamphlets.

For the enactment of laws which will wipe out of existence associations which openly or covertly prevent or delay the assimilation of citizens of German extraction.

For the enactment of laws which will recognize and punish adequately, as a dangerous public enemy, one who by spreading German-hatched lies, or by other means, attempts to interfere with the operation of the conscription laws.

For laws which by drastic penalties and rigid enforcement will destroy every phase of the system by which a cunning and cruel enemy strives to hamper our defense.

We do not present this petition without reflection. We believe that at this day the great mass of the loyal citizens of these United States are awake to the dangers herein indicated; that they are ready to face and overcome them and aid wholeheartedly in the enforcement of a system of laws enacted to that end.

We confidently assert that there is a nation-wide realization of the truth that peace-time laws, made at a time when we were ignorant of Germany's designs, and of the extent and character of the German propaganda, are pitifully inadequate for our present needs.

We submit that aside from all questions of danger to our very existence as a Nation, the continued activity among us of the bold and insolent agents of arrogant and brutal Germany is an intolerable insult, to which a free people may not longer be expected to submit.

We shall win this war. The spirit which animates this greatest of free nations will not brook defeat.

We have a precious heritage to guard, and we shall guard it. Our women and our children shall not know the horrors of a German triumph, but let it not be said of us that we prolonged this war a single day or sacrificed the life of a single brave man because we permitted our power to support our soldiers and our allies to be impaired, because we hesitated at hanging those who would have stabbed our defenders in the back and made of us the victims of German domination.

Mr. ROUSE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back nine minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], a member of the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I shall be very much pleased if the Members present will refrain from asking questions until I can explain the provisions of the bill, and then at the end of 20 minutes I shall be glad to devote myself to answering any questions, but up to that time I would like to go on with an explanation of the bill H. R. 9414.

There seems to have been some controversy as to whose bill this is, and in order to clear up any misgivings as to whose name ought to be carried in the bill, I want to say that it is a committee bill. It is prepared by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and bears the name of the chairman, who had the right to have his name attached to it as the result of the work of the committee over which he presides. I am but a very humble member of the committee and have no desire for any distinction in connection with any work I do on the committee. I make no claim to superiority of thought or work or deed, and I want everybody to distinctly understand that if there is anybody jealous of proprietary ownership in this or any other bill, I am not the one. All I want to do is to have an opportunity to work, and I am glad to have that opportunity.

Now for the bill. First, this bill provides that for and during the period of the war and for 90 days after a certain percentage of increase shall be granted to certain employees of the Post Office Department. There are about 270,000 men and women in the Post Office Department, and, of course, whatever increase in compensation may be granted them is going to involve the expenditure of a lot of money. But the expenditure of a lot of money does not mean anything if we intend to do justice. If there was but a single individual involved in the principles that are laid down in this bill, I venture to say that no man in the United States would object to the increased compensation

recommended by the bill, but merely because there are two hundred and seventy thousand and odd men and women involved in it it may be said it costs too much money. Now, the money does not concern me. It is justice that is at stake. [Applause.] And if it is just to deal on this proposition with one employee, it is equally just to deal with 270,000 employees. The question of justice is the question with which we are to deal, not with the volume of money that is involved. We are fighting a world war for justice regardless of cost in either men or money. Who will deny our right to do justice to the men in the Postal Service?

Now, this bill provides at the outset that it shall only continue in force until 90 days after the proclamation of peace. I want to be frank with the House. I am in favor of eliminating that temporary provision of the bill. I want to see the law made permanent. [Applause.] I believe the justice of the case demands it. It says that for this period, brief or long, as the case may be, the rural carriers, the maximum salary of whom is \$1,200, shall receive 15 per cent in addition to what they now receive. Now, the reason why it says up to \$1,200 is that \$1,200 is the highest pay. If \$1,500 was the highest pay, this 15 per cent would go to the \$1,500, because that is what it does in other cases where the compensation of the men employed in the service is \$1,500.

Then it provides that, in addition to the 15 per cent, we are to pay \$24 per mile per annum for each mile that a rural carrier travels over 24 miles. He gets nothing now. That is the difference between what the bill proposes and what the existing law provides, so that if a man to-day traveled 30 miles and delivers the mail on that route for \$1,200 a year, he will receive under the provisions of this bill \$1,524 a year, or \$324 a year more. I think that is sufficient explanation of that.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I would rather not until I get to the end of these matters. I think it will be better to make a consecutive statement. Then I will yield.

Now, with respect to the city clerks and carriers I want to say that in 1907 the Congress enacted what is known as the classification law. Under that classification law the clerks and carriers were placed in six classes. The first class was paid \$800 a year, and these men were automatically promoted from \$800 a year, which was the entrance salary, up to \$1,200; and in that classification law there was a provision for special clerks, ranging up to \$1,300 and \$1,400, so that to-day we have classes in the carrier and clerk service running from \$800 to \$1,400 a year.

This bill proposes to continue the classification of these men. But it starts them in at \$1,000 a year instead of \$800 a year, and lands them finally at \$1,500 a year instead of \$1,400 a year. That is the story. They get no percentage increase. They simply retain their classification. They received no percentage increase last year when the employees of every other branch of the Government had their salaries increased. They were not considered as worthy.

Now, why should we treat the clerks and carriers on a different basis from other branches of the service?

I will tell you why. It is said that we ought not to pay men in the Postal Service more than is being paid in other branches of the Government service. I do not agree with that, and I have a reason for my disagreement, and I am going to tell you what it is.

To begin with, the men who enter the other branches of the service enter to perform routine work, and their hours of labor are eight per day, and they continue to go up from class to class and receive additional compensation as they move from one class to another. But they never have to work more than 8 hours a day, whereas the clerks and carriers are compelled to be on call for duty 10 hours every day. Not that they have to work 10 hours, but they must be on call. A man might just as well be at work as on call, and some men would a good deal rather work than be sitting around waiting for the hour to come when he should begin work.

Now, why are these men required to be on call? Because the trains come in at such hours that it is impossible for them to work a straight eight-hour day. In addition to that, every clerk in a first or second class office is required to learn the schemes of distributing the mail. What is the scheme of distributing the mail? It is throwing the letters which come in the post office into a given box, so that they may be dispatched for early delivery to their points of destination.

These men are required to take examinations in the study of these schemes, and it takes them two hours every day during all the period of their employment in the Postal Service to study these schemes, and they study them in their own time and at their own expense after working hours. So that these

men are working not 8 hours a day but 12 hours a day, and the character of their service is totally different from that of men and women employed in every other branch of the Government service. They are required to be examined every 30 days on the question of efficiency. They are required to stand an average of 90 per cent perfect in the distribution schemes. They are required to learn and commit to memory anywhere from 3,000 to 10,000 names of post offices; and when they have learned 10,000 names of post offices, so that they can dispatch the mails with the greatest rapidity to these towns, they are given a new scheme, and the most important thing they have then to do is to forget the old scheme while they are learning the new one; and when they have learned a second scheme they are given a third, until most of these men learn every post office in the United States.

Does anyone deny the right of better compensation to men who devote their time to such a service? It is characteristic of these men to do the thing that is best to be done for the service. They are devoted to it. They have made it what it is. Their devotion, their integrity, their untiring labor, their determination to make the department popular with the people have made this department the great department that it is. [Applause.]

Now, I am not going further into that. Then we have the railway mail clerk, who goes out from place to place, assuming the danger of travel on railroads. He works all night, while we are asleep, in order that we may be able to have our mail delivered early in the morning. He has to buy his food when he reaches his destination. He sometimes is on his trip for 18 hours on a stretch, and while the average hours of employment of a railway postal clerk are said to be only six hours and a half daily, yet, on the whole, there is no employment anywhere that shatters the nerves of men to the extent that this service does. There is a hazardous employment, extra hazardous, and it is hard work, and they are required to study these schemes.

It is true that in their case they have the time allowed them for the study of the schemes, but it is no easy matter for men to commit to memory thousands of names of post offices in order that they may be able to perform the duties devolved upon them by their work in such a way as to give the quickest and best possible service to the people by whom they are employed.

Then when they get into the service and have reached the highest standard of efficiency a reorganization of the service frequently finds these men turned out of the places they have reached by reason of their efficiency, and they are required to take a transfer to some unknown place, in some other section of the country; to give up the home that they have saved the money to buy; to leave their family and their friends; or, if they are unable to take the transfer which is suggested to them by the department on account of these reorganizations, they are compelled to take a place in a terminal station at \$200 a year less than they were formerly receiving. This after long years of worthy service. No other business in the world demands such sacrifices from the men employed in it as does this great service. These men are willing and glad to make the sacrifices. But, you say, why do they not enter some other service? Well, they have entered this service with the hope of making it their life work. They have learned to be experts and they are experts, but what they have learned in order to make them most efficient in the Postal Service is of no value whatever in any other service in the world. They have learned nothing that is of use in commercial life, and they can not find employment in commercial life as the result of the knowledge which they have acquired in the postal service. And so while they are experts, they have but one employer to whom they can sell their labor, their brains, and their expert knowledge, and that employer is the Government of the United States.

We men on this floor speak for the Government of the United States. Then the question is, Shall we speak justly, shall we give the consideration that the case of these men justifies, shall our consideration of their case be on the basis of how it affects the Treasury or on the measure of justice involved? Are they entitled to increased compensation for the work they do? Have they rendered service that justifies their employer in saying, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant"? If they have, then why should we not do what every other employer in the Union does to-day, recognize their right to increased compensation? Shoes that a year or two ago you could buy for \$3 a pair now cost \$7 or \$8 a pair. It costs almost twice as much for a suit of clothes as it did two or three years ago. House rents have gone up beyond recall. Everything that goes into the expense of maintaining a family has gone beyond the reach of the ordinary man. The man who could live in comfort four or five years ago on a salary of \$1,200 to-day finds himself living not on the ordinary necessities of life but having to give them up and live in the most meager way. Seventy per cent of the men

in the Postal Service in the great cities work nights. They are at work when we are asleep. They work nights for over 20 years before they earn the right to a day job. The day jobs come to the men employed in the Postal Service in the great cities by reason of seniority of service. Does anybody deny that it is much more agreeable to work in the daytime than it is to work at night? Does anyone deny that in working nights and giving up the social fabric of life these men are making sacrifices? Does anyone deny that the families of these men would be glad to have them at home in the evening? Does anyone deny that the children of these men rarely see them? Because while the children are at school or at play these men are asleep at home, and while their children are asleep at home these men are at work at night. You can not give too much consideration to these men if you want to do them justice. [Applause.]

And the period of the war for these increased compensations would not be just. They should be permanent. They are not excessive, and the recommendation of the Post Office Committee is not only reasonable but less than just.

We provide also for assistant postmasters. To-day assistant postmasters receive 50 per cent of the salary of the postmaster, but for the first time we have made it 65 per cent of the salary of the postmaster. Who will deny that these worthy men, who act as assistant postmasters throughout the country, doing the executive work of these important offices, are entitled to some consideration?

We provide also for the watchmen, the printers, the chauffeurs, the messengers, the janitors, the women in the post offices, the per diem employees, and the charwomen; and in case we have missed anybody by enumeration we provide that all employees of the Post Office Service not specifically enumerated are to be covered by the terms of this increase in compensation.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. BOOHER. I notice that the bill names all the employees except the carriers in the villages.

Mr. MADDEN. The village delivery service is in an experimental stage. There are only a certain number of villages to which delivery service has been given. The appropriation for that service is made in bulk, a lump sum, and the compensation paid to the men who act as carriers there is fixed by the Postmaster General. But the terms of this section of the bill increase the compensation which the Postmaster General has already fixed, by making it 15 per cent higher than it is to-day.

Mr. BOOHER. Does that cover these employees?

Mr. MADDEN. Absolutely. Every employee in the Postal Service, whether he is mentioned by name or not, is absolutely covered.

Mr. BOOHER. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is it not a fact that there is an efficiency record kept on these people and that before they will be promoted they will have to pass this efficiency examination?

Mr. MADDEN. The men have to stand 90 per cent at every 30-day examination or they are demoted.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What salaries do janitors get?

Mr. MADDEN. Nine hundred dollars a year for the Postal Service; but if they are employed under the Treasury Department they get \$55 a month; but we have covered the Treasury Department janitors in this bill, in the hope that the House will agree with us that we have done the right thing in providing for them.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Not many years ago, in fact quite recently, the janitors in the city post office in my home did not get \$900 a year.

Mr. MADDEN. They do not get it now, because the janitors in the post office of the gentleman's city are Treasury Department employees.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does this bill make any provision for them at all?

Mr. MADDEN. It does. It puts them on the same basis as the janitors in the Postal Service.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It gives them only 15 per cent increase.

Mr. MADDEN. It gives them 15 per cent.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am in favor of the increases which are given in this bill, but I do not think an increase of only 15 per cent to a janitor in my city or in any other city who gets only \$55 a month is a sufficient increase. A man who gets \$600 a year, with an increase of 15 per cent, will then get only \$690, and that is not a living wage in these days.

Mr. MADDEN. I agree with the gentleman exactly. He ought to get more.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. He ought to get more. Now, why should not a man who is as poor as that, and is obliged to support himself and his wife and children on \$600 a year, get more than a \$90 increase? Why make any man work all day for the United States Government for \$600 a year.

Mr. MADDEN. I will say in reply to my friend from Wisconsin that we did not have jurisdiction over the men that he refers to, but we assumed the jurisdiction in order that we might do something for them. Now, I can not yield further. We assumed jurisdiction, but I believe the Appropriation Committee allowed \$120 a year to these men in addition to what they were receiving. So it has no place in this bill.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; briefly.

Mr. LOBECK. In the Treasury Department they pay on an average \$600 for laborers that work on the outside of the halls in the Federal buildings of the post office. Laborers on the inside are getting on the average—

Mr. MADDEN. Nine hundred dollars a year, but that is under the Post Office Department.

Mr. FARR. Has the Post Office Committee got jurisdiction of the firemen?

Mr. MADDEN. No; they are under the Treasury Department.

Mr. FARR. They will not get the 15 per cent.

Mr. MADDEN. They will not get that in this bill, but the general bill passed a few days ago will give them each \$120 more than they now get.

Mr. LARSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LARSEN. In my town the assistant postmaster receives \$620, and one clerk—the chief clerk—under the terms of this bill would receive \$1,500. The assistant postmaster at the present time gets a half of the salary of the postmaster.

Mr. MADDEN. The assistant postmaster—

Mr. LARSEN. I have not finished my question.

Mr. MADDEN. I know what the gentleman is going to say, that he will get less than the chief clerk. But he can transfer himself from the position of assistant postmaster to that of clerk and take his job. He would not get anything under any circumstances unless the committee decided to give assistant postmasters consideration. There is no reason why assistant postmasters should get a higher percentage than anybody else. If he is unfortunate enough to occupy a position which is not up to the grade of the clerk, he can take the place of the clerk.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Very briefly.

Mr. KEARNS. I understood the gentleman to say a while ago that all the clerks in the mail service in the Post Office Department had increased compensation under this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Everybody is increased under the bill that works for the Post Office Department—everybody; you do not have to stop to enumerate them.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman does not include third-class postmasters.

Mr. MADDEN. We do not take postmasters into consideration at all; they are not employees.

Mr. KEARNS. There are 120 chief clerks.

Mr. MADDEN. Every man receiving compensation below \$1,800 is increased.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. What is the increased compensation for clerks at third-class post offices?

Mr. MADDEN. Third-class offices have no clerks. The clerk hire is allowed by the Postmaster General out of a lump-sum appropriation that is placed at the discretion of the Postmaster General.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. They are not increased?

Mr. MADDEN. Not unless the Postmaster General increases the compensation of the postmasters. They are not clerks, but are paid out of the amount that is allowed to the postmaster. I want to call attention to the fact that we have fixed an eight-hour day for laborers who work in the Post Office Department, and that is something that they never had before. [Applause.] In the last bill passed by Congress last year there was an increased compensation of 5 to 10 per cent. It was provided that men receiving up to \$1,000 in the Post Office Service should be the beneficiaries of that compensation, but the Comptroller of the Treasury ruled that the increased compensation could not apply to any person in the Post Office Service, no matter whether he came within the range of salary or not, if he had been in the service before the 3d of March last year. So while men who have been in the service for years and were experts were denied the right of increased compensation, the men who came in after the 3d of March received it. We have a provision in this bill that is retroactive and which provides that the men who

were denied the right of increased compensation, which Congress intended they should have, shall be paid from the 1st of July last up to the time this law becomes effective. So they are provided for.

One more thing. We provide for an increased compensation to fourth-class postmasters. To-day the law provides that fourth-class postmasters shall have all of the cancellations up to \$50, 60 per cent up to another amount, 50 per cent over a certain amount, and 40 per cent over a certain other amount.

This bill provides that the fourth-class postmasters are to receive all cancellations up to \$100, and that the present law shall be effective in every other respect, so that now under the provisions of this bill in fourth-class offices where the cancellation amounts to \$100 a quarter, every dollar of that will go to the fourth-class postmaster, and he will thereby receive \$80 a year more than he is receiving to-day. If he has more cancellations than \$100 per quarter he will receive the same percentages on these cancellations that he receives to-day under existing law.

Now, I want to pay my compliments to the members of the Post Office Committee for the uniform courtesy they have shown to me in connection with the work on which we have been engaged. A draft of this bill and an agreement to the terms of the bill has been no easy matter. We have reached our conclusions as the result of compromise. Sometimes we have not agreed happily. But before we got through we were all happy and all a single family, and, although there may be members of the Post Office Committee who are opposed to this bill, and have the right to express their views as I claim the right to express mine, I shall not find fault with any man on the committee or elsewhere if he does not agree with me. I believe that this bill is a good bill, except that its provisions for increased compensation are temporary instead of permanent. [Applause.]

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon this bill in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, in the 20 minutes allotted to me I regret to say that I will not have time to discuss all of the provisions of the bill that I would like to, and there are therefore some that I shall not attempt to discuss. Your committee had this legislation under advisement for more than two months. We had extended hearings and representatives were there from all branches of the Postal Service, from the rural free-delivery associations, from the railway mail clerks' association, and the post office, and the city letter carriers, as well as the fourth-class postmasters. About 150 Members of Congress appeared in person before our committee indorsing this legislation.

The first provision of the bill refers to the Rural Free Delivery Service and provides that carriers in that service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum, and \$24 per mile per annum for each additional mile over 24 miles. At the present time a rural carrier's compensation for a standard route of 24 miles is \$1,200. There are quite a number of routes in the United States more than 24 miles in length. Some of them are as much as 28 and 30 miles in length, and for these extra miles more than 24 miles the carrier gets absolutely nothing. We must all agree that that is not fair to the carrier. We provide a flat increase of 15 per cent up to and including the \$1,200 salary, and \$24 per mile for the excess miles above 24. The average compensation of rural carriers is \$1,174 per annum. Out of this compensation he must pay for his equipment, for a horse and buggy, and the maintenance of both, and in some instances—and I know that this is true in my own district—some carriers must use two horses because of road conditions. I have had some statements furnished me which would show that the expense of some of the rural carriers throughout the country is almost as much as the compensation they are receiving from the Government. This, as a matter of course, has caused quite a number of resignations, and from July 1, 1917, to December 30 of the same year there were 3,705 resignations in the Rural Free Delivery Service.

Mr. HELM. How many of those resignations were due to enlistment in the Army or as a result of conscription?

Mr. BELL. That I do not know; but I think the percentage is small. I do not know just what it is. I am sorry that I can not give the gentleman that information.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a suggestion?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to say to the rural carriers of the country that they have no better friend anywhere in America

than the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BELL], who has devoted himself, in season and out of season, to the promotion of justice to these men. [Applause.]

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. DYER. I just want to supplement the statement of the gentleman from Illinois in what he said in respect to the gentleman from Georgia as a friend of the rural carriers by saying that the gentleman from Georgia is one of the best friends of the Postal Service employees in the big cities and the country over that we have ever had on the Post Office Committee. [Applause.]

Mr. ALMON. As I understand, those rural carriers drafted into the military service do not resign, but they are given a leave of absence and a substitute is put in their place until their return.

Mr. BELL. They can resume their work at the end of the war. Mr. Chairman, there are 43,444 rural routes in the United States. There are 43,318 carriers. There are more routes than there are carriers for the reason that a carrier can carry two routes; that is, three times a week. Hence the difference in the number of carriers and the number of routes. The average mileage on the 43,444 routes in the United States is 25.29. So you can see the large number of routes that are more than 24 miles, which the carriers now only receive \$1,200 for carrying. Here is an item that I believe is of interest to us all and that we will appreciate. The cost of delivering mail over the rural routes in the United States, with the large number that we have, is only 15 cents per mile. It costs the Government of the United States only 15 cents per mile to deliver the vast quantity of mail that it does now to the rural sections of the country, and this service, in my judgment, is the greatest blessing the people in the rural sections have received from their Government in a hundred years.

The daily average covered, in miles, is 1,103,662. The annual mileage covered is 338,824,337. The rural mail is delivered every year in the United States to 5,882,797 families, representing 27,000,000 people. So you may see that with an annual appropriation of not more than \$53,000,000 you are delivering at the doors of the people in the rural sections to one-fourth of the population of the United States.

I regret to take issue with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads when he made the statement that the star service was as good service as that of the rural free delivery. The distinguished chairman must have been dreaming and thinking about the service that we had just after the Civil War. There is no comparison between the service of the rural free delivery and that of the star-route service, and I would dislike very much, and I hope I will never live to see the day that the Government of the United States will go back to the old star-route contract service. [Applause.] The cost of the Rural Free Delivery Service to each patron annually in the United States is only \$1.95. Something was said about the salaries of the assistant postmasters of the first and second class. They were paid—

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOWELL. Did the committee consider the question of making an allowance for the upkeep or for the expense of the carrier rather than the additional expense of the carrier at the present time?

Mr. BELL. We did consider that; yes, sir. We thought it would be very much better to provide a flat increase up to salaries of \$1,200, and then give them increase for the mileage over 24 miles, than to have the equipment allowance, because it would be less work for the department and more satisfactory to the carriers.

Mr. DOWELL. Could not there have been a limited amount for upkeep and expenses that would have covered all of the carriers in the country?

Mr. BELL. Well, I think so; yes. But, as I have said, I think the increase we have given the carriers is very much more satisfactory to them and to the department.

Mr. DOWELL. Is it sufficient? Under the increase the gentleman has just given I think the expenses are something in the neighborhood of \$600 per annum for each carrier?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. The added increase will not take care of that expenditure?

Mr. BELL. Well, it will in most instances, I think, and possibly in all of them.

The salaries of assistant postmasters in first and second class post offices could not, under current law, exceed 50 per cent of

the postmaster's salary. We provide an increase of 15 per cent for these assistant postmasters, and they are entitled to it. My observation teaches me that the assistant postmasters in first and second class post offices, in many instances, do really more work and have more responsibility than the postmaster himself.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. Is that 15 per cent on the assistant postmaster's salary or 15 per cent of the principal's salary that is granted to the assistant?

Mr. BELL. No; they are entitled to 15 per cent where they receive salaries up to and including \$1,200 per annum.

Mr. SLOAN. Assistant postmasters?

Mr. BELL. Yes, sir. But they can not get more than 50 per cent of the postmaster's salary now.

Mr. SLOAN. And they get under your bill 65 per cent of the postmaster's salary?

Mr. BELL. They get 15 per cent added to the amount which they get.

Mr. SLOAN. Of their own salary or 15 per cent of the principal's salary?

Mr. BELL. Of their own salary.

Here is the section that I want to call special attention to—section 4, which says:

That the Postmaster General shall have authority to investigate conditions arising from contracts in the star route and screen and wagon service with a view to adjusting compensation and adjust the same in cases where the facts disclose the necessity for such adjustment.

That is the only way by which we felt the star contractors, who are now suffering in the flesh on account of the low bids submitted and the contracts accepted, on account of the high cost of living, could be helped, and the only way by which we could do anything for them, and we were obliged to leave it in the discretion of the Postmaster General. Under the present law, if a contractor refuses to carry his contract further it becomes the duty of the sureties on that contract to carry that mail. If they refuse to do it, then the Government proceeds to collect the amount on the bond.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman know how many of these contracts could be modified under the provisions of the bill just referred to?

Mr. BELL. No. That would take a personal investigation by a representative of the department in order to find that out.

Mr. DOWELL. Did the committee make an investigation as to the condition of these contracts and as to what it would cost the Government to revise the contracts in accordance with the provision of the bill?

Mr. BELL. They did not undertake that, but they allow the Postmaster General and give him discretion to change these contracts where the circumstances justify it, and the investigations will be made by representatives of the department.

Mr. DOWELL. In other words, if the contract was made before the war on terms that the contractor could not comply with because of the high cost of living, the Postmaster General is permitted to make a change in that contract to fit the present conditions? Is that the purpose of this?

Mr. BELL. That is correct. That is the intention of this provision.

Mr. SLOAN. For what period are these contracts of which you speak usually drawn?

Mr. BELL. For a four-year period.

Mr. PLATT. Is the gentleman going to touch upon the \$300,000 appropriation for motor mail routes before he concludes?

Mr. BELL. I will hardly have the time to do that, I guess. I only wish I had the time to do so.

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. HELM. Are the increases provided for in this bill annual increases or do they increase year after year?

Mr. BELL. Which particular branch of the service do you refer to?

Mr. HELM. In other words, I understood the chairman to say that this would make an increase of \$26,000,000 next year. What are the probable increases year after next?

Mr. BELL. He was referring then to city carriers, I think.

Mr. HELM. What is the estimated annual increase as the result of the passage of this bill?

Mr. BELL. Well, about \$30,000,000.

Mr. HELM. That is for the first year?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. HELM. What will it be for the second year?

Mr. BELL. It would be more, but I would not undertake to give the exact figures.

Mr. BLACK. I can give the figures, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. BELL. I will be glad to do that.

Mr. BLACK. The increase, if the bill is passed as it stands, will be for the first year \$25,000,000 plus, and for the next year \$36,000,000, and for the third year \$48,000,000, and for the fourth year \$53,000,000, in round numbers.

Mr. HELM. What about the fifth year?

Mr. BLACK. Well, it reaches the peak of cost about the fourth year.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, let me inquire how much time I have to my credit?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas). The gentleman has four minutes left.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Some time ago there was a bill in the House for the relief of a screen-wagon contractor in Kansas City. I presume that this bill will cover his case?

Mr. BELL. It does. I would like to say to the gentleman, too, that that was one of the cases that attracted my attention and caused me to ask the committee to put that provision in the bill. It was particularly that case at Kansas City, Mo., and I have some cases in my district which should have readjustment.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Did the committee have its attention called to other specific instances?

Mr. BELL. I do not think the committee did, as a whole, but I think individual members did.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. There is no doubt of the equity in that case?

Mr. BELL. No; I have no doubt of it.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I would like to ask the gentleman a question about the compensation of employees in third-class post offices.

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Is it the gentleman's contention that the bill does not carry any increase to employees of third-class post offices?

Mr. BELL. It is my understanding that it does not carry any increase to employees of third-class post offices.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. What is the explanation of this language, beginning in line 17, "and all other postal employees not enumerated in section 1 whose rate of compensation is \$1,200 or less per annum shall receive 15 per cent increase in their compensation"?

Mr. BELL. My understanding is that clerks in post offices of the third class are not strictly postal employees under the Government service, but are selected by and through the postmaster himself and paid through the postmaster.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. I have a statement made by the Postmaster General, which has been handed to me by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], in reference to the bill H. R. 9414, which is the bill under consideration, and in his statement of the amount of appropriation necessary to carry out the increase he says, "15 per cent increase to the clerical employees at third-class offices, \$300,000."

Mr. BELL. These clerks are paid through the postmasters, as I understand it, and they are not strictly postal employees of the Government. They are paid out of an allowance, a lump-sum amount, a lump-sum appropriation, and it is in the discretion of the Post Office Department as to how much will be allowed to any particular post office for that purpose.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. That lump-sum appropriation is \$2,000,000, as I understand it?

Mr. BELL. Yes; I think so.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Fifteen per cent of that would be \$300,000. That is the amount the Postmaster General estimates as necessary to increase the salaries of the postal employees 15 per cent.

Mr. BELL. The increase here is to the postal employees. These are not, in a sense, postal employees, but they are employed by the postmaster, and paid by him, and partly out of his own pocket sometimes.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Evidently the Postmaster General construes that differently, in view of his statement in connection with the bill. Does not the gentleman think those employees are entitled to have their compensation increased along with the others? I believe they are about the poorest paid of all.

Mr. BELL. I would be willing to support something for these people because I think they are entitled to it.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The gentleman thinks they should be taken care of in the bill?

Mr. BELL. Yes; I think so.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. Yes.

Mr. LOBECK. In line 2 assistants in first and second class post offices are mentioned, and then they are not mentioned afterwards, where they belong, whether in first or second class offices. They might be in the third class.

Mr. BELL. Assistant postmasters in offices of the first and second classes are paid direct by the Government.

Mr. LOBECK. But the language here would indicate that any post-office clerk employed in the post-office service would be entitled to this increase. Unless it is amended, it seems to me it might be construed in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Well, in reply to what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LOBECK] said, this latter language does not seem to connect up with the language in the first part of the section.

Mr. LOBECK. That is what I was referring to.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Evidently these officials' salaries would be increased under this bill.

Mr. BELL. Does the gentleman mean clerks in third-class offices?

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Yes. At least if the Postmaster General so construed it. Now, my friend knows that these people are really about the poorest paid in the public service.

Mr. BELL. Yes; they are poorly paid, but they are employed by the postmasters themselves, and that portion of their compensation paid by the Government is paid to the postmaster and paid out by him to the clerks in his office.

Mr. RANDALL. The clerks in third-class post offices are not employees of the Post Office Department at all. They are employees of the postmaster. He fixes the salary of his clerk and pays it himself, and most of it is paid out of his own pocket. The Post Office Department has nothing to do with the amount of it.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. But the Post Office Department has something to do with the amount of it, because it makes the allowance for clerk hire at that particular point.

Mr. RANDALL. Certainly; but that is no indication of the salary the clerk receives. The postmaster pays a portion of the salary out of his own pocket.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. The postmaster would not be permitted to pay it unless he had an employee there.

Mr. RANDALL. Certainly; but he pays a part of it out of his own pocket.

Mr. LOBECK. He has to write to the Postmaster General to get this clerk.

Mr. ALMON. Is not that clerk a post-office clerk?

Mr. RANDALL. He is not paid a salary as a post-office clerk.

Mr. BELL. The gentleman from California is correct in his statement. I am glad to see such universal approval, on both sides of the aisle, of this bill. I feel that it is a meritorious measure, and I trust it will pass without a dissenting vote.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HAMLIN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on March 21, 1918, approved and signed bills of the following titles:

H. R. 175. An act to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 and for prior years, and for other purposes"; and

S. 3752. An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes.

INCREASED COMPENSATION TO EMPLOYEES OF THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. STEENERSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I note with much gratification the legislation proposed in the pending bill for the improvement of the conditions of the employees in the Postal Service. I have attended hearings on the bill and registered my approval of its purposes and objects, particularly those relating to the increase of compensation.

The Postal Service is the one great department of the Government with which the public is thoroughly familiar, and therefore is the most popular branch of the Government service. The expansion of postal facilities by the incorporation of the parcel-post act and the Postal Savings System has been universally approved by the people.

The letter carriers and clerks in the City Delivery Service must be high-minded men of exceptional physical ability and, moreover, possess unusual intelligence to pass the prescribed civil-service examination before they can enter the service. Their duties are arduous and exacting and require the exercise of uniform patience and courtesy. The discipline of the service is extremely strict and the penalties imposed for infraction of the rules is rigorous and severe.

They are intrusted with the collection and delivery of the mail, which contains securities of great value and carry messages of sorrow and joy to the people in every walk of life. The trusted messengers of the people, they are and must be men of high character and integrity, possessed of personal traits whereby they can render satisfactory service to an exacting public.

Postal employees should receive compensation commensurate with the responsibility of the duties they perform and should likewise be granted every reasonable consideration to encourage the rendition of high-grade service. I am confident the people will welcome the passage of this legislation, as is evidenced by the adoption of affirmative resolutions by numerous civic and other nonpartisan organizations throughout the country. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will adopt in the near future more comprehensive remedial legislation than that outlined in the pending bill.

I shall continue to give this bill my unqualified support and trust that some small measure of justice will be granted to the splendid body of men in the Postal Service by the prompt enactment of the pending bill into public law.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] five minutes.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes allotted to me I will not attempt to go into the bill in general. I do want to say, however, that it is a very pleasing thing that so many Members of the House are alive to the real situation that confronts the men who are employed in the Post Office Department. That is one of the reasons why your committee have worked so hard to bring in a bill that will pass in this Congress. I would go even further than this bill goes, if I had my way, and make a further increase in many of these salaries. I would also wipe out that provision in the bill which makes it apply only during the war. If the speeches that have been made here to-day in behalf of the employees of the Post Office Department are any criterion to go by, then I think it will be in keeping with the minds of the Members of this House to adopt an amendment which will be offered wiping out the limitation and making these increases permanent law.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Do I understand that amendment will be offered by the committee?

Mr. TAGUE. No; I did not say that. But I understand the amendment is to be offered.

Mr. DYER. I hope it will be offered and I hope it will pass.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, this bill aims to bring about partial justice to the men who serve in the post offices of the country. This branch of the service is to my mind nearer and closer to the people than any other and at the same time altogether different from any other branch of the public service. The men who enter the employment of the Post Office Department have to wait years before they have an opportunity to earn even a fair day's pay. They enter the department first as substitutes and are obliged to report at the post office every morning after they have been called to do substitute work. Some days some of them earn barely enough to pay their car fare back and forth from and to their homes. Then when they enter the permanent service they receive \$800 a year, and it is five years before they reach the point where they are getting anywhere near a compensation sufficient to take care of their families.

Not alone that, but 75 per cent of all the service of the clerks in the post offices is performed during the night. My colleague on the committee [Mr. MADDEN] has told you that these clerks are compelled to work 8 and 10 hours. They are also obliged to work the time that it takes them to make the efficiency tests. Add to this the time it takes in going back and forth to and from their work, and in many instances the total amount is more than 12 hours in each day.

They enter this service young, active, virile men, able to meet the efficiency tests, able to meet any demand that is made upon

them. They enter the service with a vigor and determination to do something for the Government and to perform good service. What do they receive in return? By the character of the work which they do they grow old in service before they are old in years, prematurely old by the labor they have to perform under artificial light, many times in insanitary workshops, working day and night, laboring earnestly for the mere pittance that they receive.

The carriers work in all kinds of weather; in rain or sunshine, in cold and heat, and many times under very trying conditions.

When they have grown old they are either demoted temporarily or discharged immediately from the service of the Government and are unfit to perform service in any other department. That is because the service is different from any other service. There is no other employer in the country that employs men to do that same service. They have no competitor; they can not sell their services to any other employer; the moment they cease to be of value to the Government of the United States that moment they cease to be of any earning value to themselves or their families, [Applause.]

There are a number of reasons, valid and substantial reasons, why the Congress should as speedily as possible enact legislation granting wage increases for post-office clerks, city letter carriers, railway mail clerks, and other deserving postal employees.

It is not exactly accurate to say that postal clerks and city letter carriers are seeking a wage increase. A wage restoration is the more exact term. The present maximum wage standard for these groups of workers was fixed in 1907. Every upward jump of the cost of living since that time—and there have been many—has operated as a wage reduction for these men. Hence any increase in their compensation at this time would merely place them in the same status they were in a decade ago when Congress fixed the existing maximum wage standard.

One of the best arguments in favor of a higher wage for postal employees is found in the report from the House Post Office Committee submitted to the House in January, 1917, in support of the committee action in recommending a relatively small number of increases for special clerks and supervisory employees. It reads:

1. The high cost of living, which bears heavily on the employees whose salaries are stationary and fixed by law.
2. The fact that these employees serve an apprenticeship as substitutes for an average period of four years at an approximate wage of \$35 per month, or \$420 per annum, during their period of substitution. When they receive a regular appointment they start in at an annual salary of \$800, and if they render satisfactory service they must serve five years in regular employment before they reach the \$1,200 grade, or a total of nine years from the time that they enter the service. During the nine years these employees average \$742.22 per annum. Their work is not only hard and laborious but it requires men of exceptional ability and character to perform the duties in the efficient manner required of employees by the rules of the Post Office Department.
3. The committee is of the opinion that these promotions will tend to improve the service by giving encouragement to the employees who will profit thereby.

The above argument, while in this instance is only applied to a few of the employees, can with equal justification be applied to all.

Contrary to the general belief, post-office clerks and city letter carriers and other postal employees do not enjoy Saturday half holidays at any time throughout the year. Neither have they the benefit of a 30-day vacation or sick leave. Their vacation is limited to 15 days, and they must suffer a loss of pay for the time they lose from work on account of sickness.

NIGHT WORK.

The question of night work is a large one in the life of every post-office clerk. Approximately 70 per cent of the post-office clerks are compelled to work at night, because of the fact that most business houses and other large patrons of the post office do not deposit their mail until after the close of the business day.

The night work, performed as it is by the clerks standing at a letter case or pouch rack, working under artificial light, with the eyes constantly employed, deciphering all kinds of addresses, is unnatural, detrimental to health, and seriously impairs the eyesight.

Night work constitutes the most discouraging feature that confronts men entering the Postal Service. It cuts them off from all of the natural social life of the community; it destroys the possibility of happy home life, depriving the head of the family of the opportunity to enjoy his leisure hours with his family.

Contrary to the practice prevailing in the Government Printing Office and in the British postal service, the Government does not grant any time or wage differentials to men in the post offices who must toil at night.

RESIGNATIONS.

Although the First Assistant Postmaster General told the House Post Office Committee there were but few resignations above the normal number from the Postal Service, there is posi-

tive evidence to the contrary. Postmaster Chance, of Washington, made this public statement:

Since the war started this office has lost more than 140 experienced men, and these places can not be filled by men without previous knowledge of the Postal Service.

This is a typical situation. The superintendent of mails at Chicago makes exactly the same complaint—the efficiency of the mail service is affected because experienced men are quitting for more attractive work and more attractive wages elsewhere. Any practical post-office man knows that it takes from three to five years to train a distributor. It is a shortsighted policy indeed for the Government to permit these trained, experienced men, whose work is essential in the daily task of keeping the Nation's mail in motion, to slip out of the service because of the lack of substantial recognition from the Government of their worth as workers.

Nor is this exodus from the service confined to the older and more experienced employees. In practically all of the larger offices there is great difficulty in securing auxiliary and substitute employees. I quote from an ad in the "want-ad" column of the Chicago News:

One thousand post-office clerks; examination January 28, 1918; apply thirteenth floor, Federal building.

Mr. Boyd, head of the State employment department of Illinois, made this public statement with reference to the difficulty of securing employees in the Chicago post office:

We are sending them—
Chicago post office—

men every day, but they can not keep their men. Those men are put in as substitutes at 35 cents an hour. As soon as they have been there long enough they are put on regularly at 27½ cents an hour. They are given a big scheme to study after their working hours. If it is a day shift, they work 11 hours, and the night shift works 13 hours.

The following news clipping from the Seattle paper describes a condition that is general:

RESIGN POST-OFFICE JOBS TO WORK IN SHIPYARDS.

Twelve special-delivery carriers, the entire force of the Seattle, Wash., post office, to-day served this notice on the postmaster:
"We quit December 31 to go to work in the shipyards on New Year's Day for more money."

Here is a typical letter of resignation from a clerk who is quitting the service because of the few opportunities it presents for advancement:

Mr. T. F. FLAHERTY,
Washington, D. C.

MACON, GA., February 22, 1918.

DEAR SIR: I am leaving the Postal Service because it is absolutely no satisfaction to me to remain in it longer, and because the future looks better on the outside. I think that the United States Postal Service offers the least inducement of anything I know of that a young man can drift or can get into, and especially at this time. Those who remain in it and those who may get into it surely have my sympathy. I am the fifth man to resign at this office this month. What do you think of that for an office of this size. Three of them regulars and two subs.

With very best wishes,
Yours, fraternally,

(Signed) C. A. HARDY.

Here is another letter of the same character, written by D. B. Finley, who, after five years' service in the city division of the Louisville (Ky.) post office, resigned February 1, 1918:

LOUISVILLE, KY., February 1, 1918.

DEAR FRIENDS: I am leaving the Postal Service because I feel that there is no future here for me, as I have neither personal nor political influence that might be brought to bear whereby I might be elevated from the ranks of the workers and placed in one of the more lucrative positions in the Postal Service.

I say this advisedly, because I wish you to understand that I believe firmly that under present conditions no clerk, however proficient he may be in his profession, and no matter how long and assiduously he might have worked at his duties, will either receive day work or elevation from that large body of clerks who are working when others sleep for salaries that do not compensate them for the hardships of night work and the long hours that must be devoted to scheme study.

(Signed) DANIEL BOOTH FINLEY.

UNITED STATES POSTAL EMPLOYEES MOST EFFICIENT.

This is a fact that is not generally known. Statistics show that the postal employees of the United States are more efficient with respect to handling a greater quantity of mail than the employees of the English, French, or German postal systems. In the United States the average number of pieces of mail matter handled per employee was 51,000; in Germany, 25,000; in France, 38,000; in England, 31,000. This tabulation was made in 1908, but I am quite sure the ratio in favor of the United States still holds good, despite the statements of the Postmaster General that the insistence on the part of the employees to maintain their organizations is crippling service efficiency.

INCREASE GRANTED TO OTHER EMPLOYEES.

The postal employees were the only large group of Government employees excluded from the wage increases voted to other Government employees by the Sixty-fourth Congress. In a number of declarations various governmental agencies, particularly the Council of National Defense, has urged private employers to take into consideration increased living costs in

fixing wages. It is incongruous, to say the least, for the Government to advise private employers to adopt such a policy and then fail to follow an equally enlightened policy in conducting its own establishments.

I invite your attention to the ruling made by the shipyard labor adjustment board in settling labor disputes between the employers and the shipbuilders. This covers all wooden shipyards south of Baltimore and all steel shipyards south of Newport News on both the Atlantic and Gulf coasts:

(1) Eight hours shall constitute a day's work from Monday to Saturday, inclusive: *Provided*, That during the months of June, July, and August the working day on Saturdays shall be four hours.

(2) Work in excess of these periods on any week day shall be counted as overtime and paid for at the rate of time and one-half.

(3) Work in excess of 60 hours a week for any employee shall not be permitted, except on repair work or when ordered by the Navy Department or the Emergency Fleet Corporation or to protect life or property from imminent danger.

(4) Work on Sundays and the following holidays shall be paid for at the rate of double time: New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Decoration Day or Memorial Day, Fourth of July, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day.

(5) Men employed on the night shift shall receive compensation 5 per cent higher than is paid to those employed on the day shift.

(6) Employees engaged on repair work in or upon vessels undergoing repair shall receive double time for all overtime on week days as defined above, as well as on Sundays and the specified holidays.

Assuming that the above award is a fair standard, it is significant to note that the Government in its conduct of its post offices does not even approach this standard. For instance, post-office clerks do not receive Saturday half holidays at any time during the year. Neither do they receive time and a half for overtime. It is true they are paid for overtime, but only at the prevailing rate of pay, and because of this it is difficult to make the department properly administer the eight-hour law, and excessive overtime service is imposed on distributors. Neither is there any weekly maximum number of hours set for a post-office clerk. Many of them are forced to work in excess of 60 hours weekly. As before stated, there is no wage differential for the men employed at night.

The following resolution, adopted at the convention of the American Federation of Labor held in Buffalo last November, is an expression from the organized workers of the country favorable to an increase in pay for post-office clerks and city letter carriers of not less than 25 per cent:

Resolution No. 110.—By Edward J. Gainer, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and Thomas F. Flaherty, secretary-treasurer of the National Association of Postal Employees.

Whereas the salary standard of letter carriers and post-office clerks fixed by Congress more than 10 years ago still remains the same; and Whereas the cost of living during this period has advanced an average of approximately 100 per cent; and

Whereas this increase in the cost of living has operated to all intents and purposes exactly the same as a 50 per cent reduction in wages; and

Whereas the postal employees were the only class excluded from the horizontal wage increase granted to Government employees by the last Congress, notwithstanding the fact that the Post Office is the only governmental department operated upon a self-sustaining basis, its most recent audit showing an annual surplus in excess of \$9,000,000; and

Whereas postal employees are highly specialized workers functioning in a Government monopoly, performing a service which gradually unfits them for employment elsewhere, with no hope of selling their skill to a competing private industrial establishment; and

Whereas despite this fact there have been resignations from the service in such numbers as to seriously cripple its efficiency, delaying the dispatch and delivery of all classes of mail, imperiling the business efficiency of the country at a time when such business efficiency is most needed; and

Whereas because of its oppressive labor policy the Post Office Department has been unable to keep its working force recruited to a proper standard: And therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Federation of Labor, in convention assembled, deeply deplores this self-evident injustice to a deserving class of public employees, and it urges upon Congress the immediate enactment of a law increasing the pay of these employees not less than 25 per cent; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive council be instructed to cooperate with the officers of all affiliated postal organizations to have the justice of this case brought forcibly to the attention of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each Congressman and Senator by the secretary of the American Federation of Labor.

With regard to other wage increases that have been granted, page 122 of the December Monthly Review of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that the average increase of wages in 13 classes of industries during the year from October, 1916, to October, 1917, was 18.1 per cent, and the December, 1916, Monthly Review shows that between October, 1915, and October, 1916, there was an average increase of 20.2 per cent. Similar reports for every month in the last two years have shown constantly increasing wages. The report of the New York State department of labor for November, 1917, shows that wages have increased from a ratio of 100 in August, 1915, to a ratio of 170 in November, 1917, with a ratio of increase in the number of employees from 100 to 120, or nearly 50 per cent increase within the last two and a half years.

Latest statistics of the Department of Labor are borne out with regard to food and other items of cost of living by Bradstreets reports. These reports show the cost of living, based on 100 different items, has advanced from a ratio figure of 12.08 in December, 1916, to 16.91 in November, 1917, or 32 per cent in 11 months. This is probably the best estimate that can be made of the exact increase in the cost of living.

About one-half—or 50 per cent—of the pay check is spent for food, which has advanced 86½ per cent in three years.

Assuming that all other items in the family budget have remained stationary in price, it would require pay increase of 43 per cent to break even, as against the cost of living in 1914.

What has happened to the cost of coal, shoes, clothing, and about everything else is only too well known.

Conservatively figured, the cost of living has advanced in the past three years about 75 per cent.

Were it not for the wise and energetic work of the United States Food Administration many of these prices would now be very much higher than they are. This is particularly true of flour, bread, sugar, and all canned goods.

The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, in its report of the cost of living in the District of Columbia, shows that \$1,082.80 is the least possible amount on which a family could live decently in 1916. This necessarily means that with an increase of more than 30 per cent since 1916, the majority of the Government employees have lowered the standard of living greatly, they are not living decently, that they are piling up debts which they have not any hope of paying, and that literally thousands are working nights and Sundays to make ends meet.

Because this large and important group of workers is unable to bring its grievances sharply to the attention of the Congress and the public is no valid reason for ignoring its pleas for relief year after year. These men have been patient; they have been long-suffering. Their case is a just one. Will the Congress not recognize this fact by the immediate enactment of legislation granting the postal workers increased compensation?

By unanimous consent the following Members were given leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD: Mr. DYER, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. STEENBERG.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken or may speak on the bill may have the right to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Goodwin of Arkansas). The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all who have spoken or may speak may extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DOWELL. Does that include those who had time but have not got the opportunity to occupy it?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request, because I doubt whether it could be made in committee. It will have to be made in the open House. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY].

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am, in the main, in sympathy with this measure. There are glaring inequalities in it. They should be corrected. I shall offer amendments, if others do not, to reach some of the most flagrant. I want, however, to discuss more particularly the question of rural letter carriers. It is fundamental that honest effort coupled with sobriety and economy should produce a competency. Every man who toils, whether in office or shop, in the forest or the field, produces wealth enough to maintain himself and care for his family and educate his children. No one should be required to spend his strength in the service of his fellow man either as a producer or distributor of wealth and himself be denied a decent maintenance while he toils and a competency when age shall come. Any economical system or condition that denies to the toiler these rewards is unjust and indefensible. And yet that very condition prevails with reference to rural letter carriers. The wages paid will barely maintain the carrier and family and keep up his equipage. I sincerely doubt that it will do that under the present conditions. I know he can make no provision against misfortune, disease, or old age. It matters not how earnestly and conscientiously and intelligently the carrier may serve, the end promises no more than the beginning—a bare maintenance, if that. There are no grades or classes to which he may look forward to promotion. There is nothing in the future to which he may look for relief except a sense of justice in Congress, and heretofore that has been lacking. The cost and maintenance of his equipage now consumes about one-half of his pay. His family must then be fed and clothed, his children educated, and the future provided for on an income that does not exceed the cost of a buggy and two horses and their upkeep. Put it more bluntly, he must maintain his family, feed, clothe, and educate his children, on what it costs

to feed his horses. I hardly think a condition that puts a family on a level, so far as the cost of maintenance goes, with the upkeep of a team is a just condition. And I, for one, protest against it with all the vehemence with which I am endowed. I know this condition is not right. I know that we can not justify it.

I have had the good fortune to spend one-half of my life in the country. I hope to spend there the most of the remaining part of it. I know well the conditions of the average country community. I know with what eagerness the family looks forward to the arrival of the rural letter carrier. I know how the days are made brighter when letters come, and I know something, also, of the sense of disappointment when they do not come. These conditions I speak of are of normal times. How much more, then, is the arrival of the rural letter carrier looked forward to by the family since war has come, since every family, or nearly every one, has a son with the colors, some yet in training, others already beyond the seas. I know, too, with what sympathy and cheer the letter carrier performs his duties. I have had the pleasure of accompanying many of them on their rounds. I have yet to know of one who was not faithful to his duties and courteous to every patron on his route.

It seems to me that if there is anyone who is a friend of the whole community, it is the letter carrier, who on his daily rounds distributes the mail that brings happiness or sorrow to nearly every patron on his line. I know conditions have wonderfully improved in most communities whenever a rural route has been established to serve their needs. I know, too, that most of these routes are too long, the work on them too irksome. What kind of men are these carriers that they should be discriminated against as employees of our country? Are they less patriotic than those in other lines of employment? Are they less intelligent and faithful than the city letter carriers, whose future is more or less cared for in the provisions of this bill? Are their duties less arduous? Are their responsibilities less grave? We can answer "no" to each of these queries. The rural letter carrier has to be the equal if not the superior of the city letter carrier in point of intelligence, in adaptability, in courtesy, in patience, in faithfulness, in the discharge of duties under adverse circumstances. He must not only take up and distribute the mail; he must perform most of the functions, if not all, of the fourth-class postmaster. Why, then, with all these responsibilities and multifarious duties, should he be compelled to spend for the instrumentalities by means of which he discharges his duties one-half of all that he receives in compensation for his labors? No one expects the mail clerk to have built and equipped and operated at his own expense the car in which is transported the mail. No one requires the postmaster to build and equip the office for the distribution of mail, and even the mounted city letter carriers are supplied with their full equipment. All of these perform duties no less arduous, no less responsible than the rural letter carrier, and all receive more compensation with better opportunities for advancement than he. All of them work under conditions more conducive to health, to pleasure, to comfort than he. Whoever imagines that the driving for six days in every week over a route from 25 to 30 miles in length, much of it over roads that are but barely passable, is a pleasant task when weather is fair, and how much more must it become a burden in bad weather, in the cold, amid the snows of winter.

Add to this from 200 to 500 patrons that must be served, each one entitled to all the considerations of a citizen of this great Republic, each one with his little wants, his little errands to be run, and each one a friend of the rural letter carrier and demanding that courtesy and consideration that a friend has a right to expect from a friend and that all invariably receive from the rural letter carrier. Consider all these and then say that \$1,200 a year maximum pay, one-half of which must be expended for equipage, is ample compensation for these services. It is not right and we can not justify ourselves if we demand these services and shall refuse adequate pay to this highly patriotic and deserving class of governmental employees. I know that sometimes it is said that rural letter-mail service does not pay. By that it is meant that it returns no profit in money to the Post Office Department.

But this Government is not a business institution. It owes service and should render it. If it ceases to do that it ceases to be a just Government. Every citizen is entitled to equal service, and you people who live in cities and who insist that there shall be a mail delivery every hour or two during the day, and then begrudge fair compensation to the carrier who delivers one mail a day to the farmer, have a rather peculiar viewpoint. It seems to me. I do not contend for hourly delivery of mail to the farmer, not that he is not entitled to receive it as much as the

man in the city, but because of the conditions I do not urge it; but I do urge that every farmer that can be reached is entitled to daily mail delivered at his door, and that the agent of this Government that delivers his mail is entitled to as much consideration and compensation as the man who delivers the mail to the banker, to the lawyer, or to the doctor within the city; and I hope that this is the day when we may unite our efforts to effect this even-handed justice. I want to see the rural letter carrier as generously dealt with as the clerk or city carrier. I want justice done all employees, both city and country, and I shall introduce amendments to secure this. I want to see this Government recognize the truth that the laborer is worthy of his hire; the Government equip the rural letter carrier as it provides for those who serve it in other fields. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, because I believe that the salaries of the Postal Service are disgraceful and that some of the conditions under which the men and women engaged in the service savor of slavery, I am for this bill wholeheartedly. [Applause.] I wonder if it has occurred to some of the members of this committee that when a postal employee leaves the service under any suspicion he can never again work for Uncle Sam except as a soldier. There is no other branch of the service of which that can be said. In that respect I think it is regrettable that a wage comparison has recently been submitted by an official of considerable importance in our Government, one of eminent responsibility, namely, the distinguished Postmaster General, in which he refers to the present scale of wages granted postal employees, and takes a decided stand against any increase at this time.

Referring to present wages granted postal employees and taking a stand in opposition to any increase in these salaries, which he characterized as "selfish demands," the Postmaster General closes a sweeping indictment by insisting that "they are justly compensated, receiving more than three times as much as those fighting in the trenches, who must of necessity suffer the hardships of warfare and sacrifice their all if necessary."

To any person of refined instincts the impropriety of attempting to inject such evidence as a basis of wage comparison must be painfully apparent. Offensive enough in times of peace, it becomes doubly so when our country is in war. Americans are not Hessians, and it will be a sorry day for this Nation when we seek to estimate the service our soldiers are rendering on a wage basis. At an hour when every normal American feels the thrill of his country's call, when he feels himself lifted and exalted to deeds of sacrifice and self-denial, it comes with poor grace for an administrative official of this Government to offer money and money considerations as the chief motive that prompts such sacrifice. Were this true we may well be apprehensive for the future of this Republic.

It is only fair, however, to the great army of postal employees, and all other workers for that matter, to completely refute the argument advanced by Postmaster General Burleson. Postal employees do not receive three times as much wages as "the soldiers in the trenches," and the absurdity of this assertion may well discredit any further statements coming from the same source. Under present conditions it is doubtful if they receive as much. The compensation of the men assigned to service, in both the Army and Navy, has been materially increased, and quite properly so, by recent act of Congress, and inviting opportunities have been thus opened for capable men. A generous Government has sought to provide for every contingency affecting the material and moral welfare of our forces on land and sea.

The pay of enlisted men in the Army ranges from a minimum of \$30 a month up to \$81 a month, with some nine intervening grades that may be attained upon evidence of merit and ability. Additional ratings which carry from \$2 to \$9 per month may be achieved by evidence of especial proficiency in various lines of service. Continuous service is also rewarded by increased compensation, such increases ranging from \$3 to \$24 per month, according to grade and length of service.

The rate of pay granted in the Navy is slightly higher than in the Army. Beginning with a minimum rating of \$32.60 per month, paid to apprentice seamen of the third class, the compensation allowed for the enlisted personnel of the Navy reaches a maximum of \$83 per month as the base pay. Intervening grades with varied rates of compensation range between, and these grades may be won by satisfactory evidence of merit and application. Each reenlistment carries a material addition to the base rate of pay granted, and in like manner premiums

are allowed for each good-conduct medal a man holds. Ample provisions are also made for special duties or unusual assignments.

It is to be particularly remembered, however, that these quoted rates of pay represent a sum over and above all expense of food, clothing, and shelter, such as a worker in civil life is called on to bear. Explaining this very point, the Official Bulletin of January 11, 1918, says: "An enlisted man in active service has no necessary personal expenses except for barber and laundry. Uniforms, underclothing, shoes, hats, quarters, medical attendance, and subsistence are supplied them at Government expense." In short, the pay of the postal employee is gross, while that of the enlisted man is net; a fact that seems to have completely escaped the attention of the Postmaster General, judging by the comparison he offers. It is well to also remember that the enlisted man may purchase such materials as tobacco, postage, confectionery, and incidentals of individual taste at the post exchange for cost.

Ample provision is also made for free hospital service, without loss of compensation, and in addition thereto the Government has recently instituted a system of war-risk insurance to cover cases of death or disability contracted in the service. Both in the Army and Navy there has long been in operation a comprehensive and equitable plan of retirement, something that is sadly wanting in the Postal Service. Quoting again from the Official Bulletin, this plan is as follows:

RETIREMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY.

Enlisted men can apply for retirement after 30 years of service. They are retired on 75 per cent of the monthly pay drawn at the time of retirement and \$15.75 a month additional in lieu of allowances.

RETIREMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY.

Enlisted men are retired after 30 years' service and are paid three-fourths of total pay and allowances they received at date of retirement and cash in lieu of quarters and subsistence.

Similar provisions are made for the retirement of Army and Navy officers.

In thus providing for the comfort and well being of the splendid men giving service in the Army and Navy, we have done as a Nation only that which we are under moral obligation to do. We should conceive the service as a summons, to which our fellow citizens, our family and ourselves stand ready to answer on call, and we should guard its welfare with an alert and lively concern. Our devotion should not cause us to neglect or deal unjustly with another class of deserving public employees, nor should we be misled by a mean, invidious, and altogether unjustifiable comparison, even when it comes from a member of the President's Cabinet. Unworthy indeed was the motive that prompted a comparison in the wages of postal employees and the boys in the Army, but now since the issue has been dragged in, let me repeat that the statement of the Postmaster General is in nowise sustained by the facts in the case. Postal employees do not receive three times as much pay as the soldier. In fact they do not receive as much, and many plans for the protection of the soldier could be profitably borrowed by the Post Office Department. I will not pursue this uninviting comparison further and I would not have done so at all had I not felt that the unwarranted statement of the Postmaster General should not go unchallenged. Sufficient answer is this fact: If the average postal employee could count on a balance of \$30 net after his indispensable overhead expenses were settled then there would not be the widespread discontent in Mr. Burleson's Postal Service that exists at the present time. [Applause.]

I submit herewith as part of my remarks two statements printed in the Official Bulletin of January 11 and January 14, 1918, containing the rates of pay of officers and enlisted men in the Army and Navy of the United States:

COMPLETE FACTS AND FIGURES ABOUT UNITED STATES NAVY PAY ROLL, SUMS PAID VARIOUS GRADES OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN, WITH DETAILS OF HOW, WHEN, AND WHERE THEY GET MONEY.

The actual pay roll of the fighting forces of the United States is now nearly \$100,000,000 per month.

This sum is disbursed by the pay officers of the Army and Navy in the form of checks or currency or by the Treasury Department in the form of family allotments as compensation for services rendered according to the scale of pay prescribed by law for the uniformed defenders of the Nation.

This figure does not include "family allowances" which are paid by the Government toward the support of the families of enlisted men, under specified conditions, nor does it consider any of the special compensatory features of the military and naval insurance act, under which \$176,150,000 was appropriated.

THE NAVY DECEMBER PAY ROLL.

For the purpose of informing the public accurately as to the system of pay in the Navy the following authorized statement has been issued by the Committee on Public Information:

In the month of December approximately \$17,000,000 was disbursed as monthly compensation for the services of the some 300,000 officers and men who constitute the uniformed force of the United States Navy.

This was the regular Government pay and did not include any amounts that might have been paid under the war-risk act as family allowances or other compensation provided for under the terms of that act.

The system of pay in the Navy is complicated by a large number of ranks and ratings, as well as financial rewards for special merit and service. The duties of the Paymaster General of the Navy comprise not only the system of accounting and disbursement on account of monthly compensation, but all that relates to the purchase, custody, and issue of all supplies for the Naval Establishment and the keeping of the accounts. Except for the contracting and the purchase of supplies, these duties are delegated to the various officers of the Pay Corps.

PAYMENTS MADE TWICE A MONTH.

Payments to officers and enlisted men are made twice each month, to officers on the 15th and last days and to enlisted men on the 5th and 20th. It is optional with each man whether his payment is in cash or by check on the Treasurer of the United States. On foreign stations payments are made in the currency of the country the ship is visiting at the time of payment, the money being issued and charged at its official or customhouse equivalent in United States currency.

For the payment of public bills and to enable officers and men to make remittances each supply officer has a checking account with the Treasurer of the United States and necessary funds are deposited to his credit upon receipt of requisition. Requisitions are addressed to the Paymaster General and approved and forwarded by the commanding officer of the ship or station.

When a ship is in home waters cash funds are obtained by cashing a check at one of the Subtreasuries or Government depositories or by shipment of money upon direction of the Paymaster General.

GETTING CASH IN FOREIGN PORTS.

When in a foreign port cash funds are obtained through the negotiation of a Government bill of exchange. The supply officer of the fleet, division, or ship, after making inquiry of bankers, merchants, and the United States consul, negotiates a bill at the best obtainable rates, receiving the proceeds in gold or silver coins of the country. A bill of exchange is drawn on either the Secretary of the Navy or the fiscal agent of the United States at London, advantage being taken of the best rate.

Family allotments of men of the Navy are paid by the Navy disbursing officer, calling for the writing of some 100,000 checks per month, payable to relatives in all parts of the country. Because of the multiplicity of detail attached to this feature of pay a system of automatic accounting has been devised and a few Government clerks now transact this business with neither confusion nor delay.

ASSIGNMENTS OF PAY.

Assignments of pay are made out in duplicate on cards on board ship or at the station at which the grantor is serving, one copy being retained for record and the other forwarded to the Navy disbursing officer for payment. These cards are filed alphabetically in the following groups: \$5, \$10, \$15, \$20, \$25, \$30, \$35, \$40, 45, \$50, and miscellaneous. Checks with the amounts, \$5 to \$50, printed in are used.

Stencils are cut for all allotments, having the name and address of the allottee, the name of the grantor, with ship or station on which he is serving, and, in the case of the miscellaneous group, the amount of the allotment in words and figures. Thus everything except the signature of the disbursing officer is either printed or stenciled on the checks. The machine which prints in from the stencils has a capacity of 4,000 checks per hour.

OPERATION OF POSTING MACHINE.

A posting machine, operated by two young women, is used for comparing printed checks with the cards, thus preventing error. This machine has a capacity of 35 checks per minute. The cards and checks pass through this machine on belts, each set pausing before the eyes of the clerk and giving her sufficient time to make the comparison. If correct, the number of the check is automatically stamped on the card, thus keeping the account, and the disbursing officer's signature is printed in facsimile. The law demands that there be on all Government checks the actual handwriting of an official, so all of these checks have to be signed by an employee in the disbursing officer's department. For this an electric duplicating pen is used, the officer putting a fountain-pen signature on 10 checks by one movement of his hand. A rapid writer may sign 4,000 checks per hour by these means.

ANNUAL BASE PAY OF OFFICERS.

All commissioned officers of the active list of the Navy receive the same pay and allowances according to rank and length of service. Officers of the Medical, Pay, and Construction Corps, chaplains, civil engineers, and professors of mathematics have the relative ranks of the various grades of the line, the annual base pay of each grade being as follows:

Admiral (in command of fleet)	\$10,000
Vice admiral (second in command of fleet)	9,000
Rear admiral, upper half	8,000
Rear admiral, lower half	6,000
Commodore	6,000
Captain	4,000
Commander	3,500
Lieutenant commander	3,000
Lieutenant	2,400
Lieutenant (junior grade)	2,000
Ensign	1,700

To each commissioned officer below the rank of rear admiral is allowed 10 per cent of his yearly base pay for each five years of service in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, but not exceeding in all 40 per cent. Additional provision is made by law that the pay of a captain shall not exceed \$5,000, a commander \$4,500, and a lieutenant commander \$4,000 per annum.

SEA AND FOREIGN SHORE DUTY.

An officer on sea or on shore duty beyond the continental limits of the United States receives while so serving 10 per cent additional of his pay.

An officer on shore duty where no Government quarters are furnished is paid \$12 per month for each of the number of rooms to which his rank entitles him, that is:

	Rooms.
Rear admiral, upper half	9
Rear admiral, lower half	8
Captain	7
Commander	6
Lieutenant commander	5
Lieutenant	4
Lieutenant (junior grade)	3
Ensign, warrant officer, and nurse	2

Varying allowances for heat and light, depending upon the month and place of duty, are allowed for the number of rooms actually occupied, but not exceeding the number to which an officer's rank entitles him.

Aids to rear admirals of the upper half are each paid \$200 per annum, and aids to rear admirals of the lower half \$150 each per annum.

STUDENT NAVAL AVIATORS.

Officers of the Navy appointed student naval aviators and while detailed for duty involving actual flying in aircraft receive the pay and allowances of the rank plus 35 per cent increase thereof, and those officers who have qualified as naval aviators shall, while so detailed, receive the pay and allowances of their rank plus 50 per cent thereof.

Boatswains, gunners, pay clerks, machinists, carpenters, sailmakers, and pharmacists are known as warrant officers, and are paid as follows:

	At sea.	On shore.	Waiting orders.
First 3 years' service	\$1,500	\$1,125	\$875
Second 3 years' service	1,625	1,250	1,000
Third 3 years' service	1,750	1,375	1,125
Fourth 3 years' service	2,000	1,750	1,250
After 12 years' service	2,250	2,000	1,500

Warrant officers on shore duty receive the same allowances for quarters and heat and light as an ensign.

After six years from date of warrant these officers are, if duly qualified, commissioned chief warrant officers and receive the pay and allowances of ensign. After 6 years from date of commission each commissioned warrant officer with a creditable record receives the pay and allowances of a lieutenant (junior grade), and after 12 years from date of commission the pay and allowances of a lieutenant.

Warrant officers while attached to a seagoing ship are paid a ration allowance of 40 cents per day.

All officers in the Regular Navy are required to provide their own uniforms and to pay for subsistence both ashore and afloat.

THE ENLISTED PERSONNEL.

The enlisted personnel of the Navy is of various classifications, depending upon their duties. Entry into the service is usually made in the lower ratings and the men are advanced upon the establishment of qualifications for the higher ratings. The following tables show the classifications and the base monthly pay of each rating during the present war as provided by the act of May 22, 1917:

Chief petty officers.

Chief master at arms	\$77.50
Chief boatswains' mates	61.00
Chief gunners' mates	61.00
Chief turret captains	72.00
Chief quartermasters	61.00
Chief machinists' mates	83.00
Chief electricians	72.00
Chief carpenters' mates	61.00
Chief water tenders	61.00
Chief yeomen	72.00
Chief storekeepers	61.00
Chief pharmacists' mates	72.00
Bandmasters	63.20
Chief commissary stewards	83.00
Chief printers	72.00

Any of the above-named chief petty officers who has served as such for one year with credit is given what is known as a "permanent appointment," which increases his base pay to \$83 per month.

Petty officers, first class.

Master-at-arms, first class	\$52.00
Boatswains' mates, first class	52.00
Gunners' mates, first class	52.00
Turret captains, first class	61.00
Quartermasters, first class	52.00
Boilermakers	77.50
Machinists' mates, first class	66.50
Coppersmiths	66.50
Shipfitters, first class	66.50
Electricians, first class	61.00
Blacksmiths	61.00
Plumbers and fitters	55.50
Sailmakers' mates	52.00
Carpenters' mates, first class	52.00
Water tenders	52.00
Painters, first class	52.00
Storekeepers, first class	52.00
Pharmacists' mates, first class	52.00
Yeomen, first class	52.00
First musicians	47.60
Commissary stewards	72.00
Ships' cooks, first class	66.50
Bakers, first class	55.50
Printers, first class	52.00

Petty officers, second class.

Master-at-arms, second class	46.50
Boatswains' mates, second class	46.50
Gunners' mates, second class	46.50
Quartermasters, second class	46.50
Machinists' mates, second class	52.00
Electricians, second class	52.00
Shipfitters, second class	52.00
Oilers	48.70
Carpenters' mates, second class	46.50
Printers, second class	46.50
Painters, second class	46.50
Storekeepers, second class	46.50
Yeomen, second class	46.50
Ships' cooks, second class	52.00
Pharmacists' mates, second class	46.50

Petty officers, third class.

Master-at-arms, third class	\$41.00
Coxswains	41.00
Gunners' mates, third class	41.00
Quartermasters, third class	41.00
Electricians, third class	41.00
Carpenters' mates, third class	41.00
Painters, third class	41.00
Storekeepers, third class	41.00
Yeomen, third class	41.00
Pharmacists' mates, third class	41.00

Seamen, first class.

Seamen gunners	36.60
Seamen	38.40
Firemen, first class	46.50
Shipwrights	35.50
Musicians, first class	43.20
Ships' cooks, third class	41.00
Bakers, second class	46.50
Hospital apprentice, first class	38.40

Seamen, second class.

Seamen, second class	35.90
Firemen, second class	41.00
Musicians, second class	41.00
Buglers	41.00
Ships' cooks, fourth class	35.50
Hospital apprentice, second class	35.90

Seamen, third class.

Apprentice seamen	32.60
Firemen, third class	36.20
Landsmen	32.60

Messmen branch.

Stewards to commanders in chief	72.00
Cooks to commanders in chief	61.00
Stewards to commandants	72.00
Cooks to commandants	61.00
Cabin stewards	61.00
Cabin cooks	55.50
Wardroom stewards	61.00
Wardroom cooks	55.50
Steage stewards	46.50
Steage cooks	41.00
Warrant officers' stewards	46.50
Warrant officers' cooks	41.00
Mess attendants, first class (United States citizen)	41.00
Mess attendants, second class (United States citizen)	35.50
Mess attendants, third class (United States citizen)	37.00
Mess attendants, first class (not United States citizen)	38.40
Mess attendants, second class (not United States citizen)	37.00
Mess attendants, third class (not United States citizen)	32.60

In addition to the pay as provided in the above tables the following amounts are also paid monthly to each enlisted man who is qualified to receive them:

One dollar and fifty cents for each successive reenlistment for four years within four months of date of honorable discharge from previous enlistment.

Five dollars and fifty cents for first reenlistment and \$3.30 for each subsequent reenlistment, if citizen of the United States and completed previous enlistment.

Two dollars and twenty cents if a seaman gunner.

Two dollars and twenty cents if a graduate of a petty officers' school.

Five dollars and fifty cents to a steward or cook who holds a certificate of qualification and is a citizen of the United States.

Eighty-three cents for each good-conduct medal a man holds.

EXTRA MONTHLY COMPENSATION.

The following extra monthly compensations are paid to men who perform the transient duties specified:

Five dollars to a seaman in charge of hold.

Five dollars to a coxswain of a steam or motor launch.

Five dollars to a captain of a gun's crew.

Five dollars to a "jack-of-the-dust."

Five dollars to a lamplighter.

Five dollars to a messman.

From \$10 to \$30 to a mail clerk, the amount depending upon the complement of the ship.

From \$2 to \$10 to a man who qualifies at target practice as a gun pointer, the amount depending upon the caliber of the gun.

From \$1 to \$3 to a signalman.

From \$10 to \$20 to a tailor or tailor's helper, the amount depending upon the complement of ship.

PAY OF SPECIAL DUTIES.

For special duties or details the following compensations are paid:
One dollar and twenty cents per hour to divers for the actual time spent under water.

Thirty-three cents per day to seamen detailed for duty as firemen.

Five dollars per month for submarine service.

One dollar per day (but not exceeding \$15 per month) spent submerged in submarine, if qualified for torpedo work.

A man detained beyond the expiration of his enlistment receives one-fourth additional of all pay while so detained.

A man receives a gratuity of four months' pay if he reenlists within four months and presents an honorable discharge from his last enlistment.

Each enlisted man receives on first enlistment an outfit of clothing and small stores free of charge. Any articles subsequently drawn are issued at cost price.

Enlisted men are subsisted by the Government. Men on detached duty are furnished cash in lieu of subsistence.

Men discharged are either furnished transportation to their homes and all expenses while en route or are paid 4 cents per mile for the total number of miles from place of discharge to their homes.

On board each ship of the Navy and at each station on shore is maintained a commissary store at which may be purchased at cost price such articles as are usually sold in civilian stores and shops.

Officers on the retired list receive three-fourths of their active-duty pay.

Enlisted men are retired after 30 years' service and are paid three-fourths of total pay and allowances they received at date of retirement and cash in lieu of quarters and subsistence.

Officers and men of the Naval Reserve Force and the National Naval Volunteers while on active duty receive the same pay and allowances as those of same rank and length of service in the Regular Navy.

When first called into active service in time of war or national emergency a uniform gratuity of \$150 is allowed each officer of the Naval Reserve and \$60 each enlisted man.

COMPLETE FACTS AND FIGURES ABOUT UNITED STATES ARMY PAY ROLL, SUMS PAID VARIOUS GRADES OF OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN, WITH DETAILS OF HOW, WHEN, AND WHERE THEY GET MONEY.

The actual pay roll of the fighting forces of the United States is now nearly \$100,000,000 per month.

This sum is disbursed by the pay officers of the Army and Navy in the form of checks or currency or by the Treasury Department in the form of family allotments as compensation for services rendered according to the scale of pay prescribed by law for the uniformed defenders of the Nation.

This figure does not include "family allowances," which are paid by the Government toward the support of the families of enlisted men under specified conditions, nor does it consider any of the special compensatory features of the military and naval insurance act, under which \$176,150,000 was appropriated.

For the purpose of informing the public accurately as to the system of pay in the Army the following authorized statement has been issued by the Committee on Public Information.

ARMY PAY NEARLY BILLION A YEAR.

The total pay of the United States Army for the month of December was approximately \$78,580,800.

Disbursements on account of the pay of officers and men of the Army are now at the rate of about \$950,000,000 per year. These figures consider solely the pay disbursed by the Quartermaster Department and do not include family allowances or compensation for disability of soldiers, provided for by the military and naval insurance act and paid by the Government through the War-Risk Insurance Bureau of the Treasury Department.

Following is a comprehensive statement of the system of pay of the Army authorized by the Quartermaster General:

The Quartermaster General of the Army, under the direction of the Secretary of War, is charged with the duty of providing for the payment of the officers, enlisted men, female nurses, field clerks, and civilian clerks of the Quartermaster Corps on duty at places other than in the office of the Quartermaster General. Due to the lack of office buildings necessary to take care of the increased number of employees required to carry on the business of the Army at Washington, it has been necessary to lease many privately owned buildings for office purposes. The Finance and Accounting Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General is charged with the details of providing funds, and interior administration in connection with the payment of the Army, and is now located in a large apartment house at the corner of Fifteenth and M Streets NW.

INTRICATE AND DIFFICULT TASK.

The intricate task of paying the officers and men of the United States Army, made more difficult by the wide expansion of the past six months, is being satisfactorily accomplished. To prevent failure to meet the monthly compensation of every man in the service, no matter where he may be located, liberal sums are furnished the various disbursing quartermasters in order promptly to meet the Army pay rolls with their extraordinary demands for funds.

The officers and enlisted men of the Army are paid at the end of each month, or as soon thereafter as possible, by the disbursing officers of the Quartermaster Corps, in cash or by check, at their stations or in the field.

If on duty in France they are paid in French currency or by United States checks, as officers and men may elect.

PAY OF ENLISTED MEN.

The pay of enlisted men depends on their grades, ratings, and length of service. From June 1, 1917, and continuing during the term of the war the pay of enlisted men is as follows:

Men receiving \$30: All privates, the Army entering grade.

Men receiving \$33: First-class privates, men promoted to act in minor noncommissioned officer capacity.

Men receiving \$36: Corporals, saddlers, mechanics, farriers, and wagoners, and musicians of the third class.

Men receiving \$38: All sergeant grades in the line, which include Infantry, Field Artillery, Coast Artillery, and Cavalry; cooks, horse-shoers, band corporals, and musicians of the second class.

Men receiving \$44: Sergeants of the various corps of the Engineers, Ordnance, Signal Corps, Quartermaster Corps, and Medical Department; band sergeants and musicians of the first class.

Men receiving \$48: Battalion sergeant majors, squadron sergeant majors, sergeant majors (junior grade), sergeant buglers, master gunners, and assistant band leaders of the line.

Men receiving \$51: Regimental sergeant majors, regimental supply sergeants, sergeant majors (senior grade), quartermaster sergeants of the Quartermaster Corps, ordnance sergeants, first sergeants, electrician sergeants of the first class, assistant engineers and battalion sergeant majors, and battalion supply sergeants of the Engineers.

Men receiving \$56: Sergeants, first class, of the Medical Department.

Men receiving \$71: Hospital sergeants, master engineers of the junior grade, and engineers.

Men receiving \$81: Quartermaster sergeants of the senior grade of the Quartermaster Corps, band leaders, master signal electricians, master electricians, master engineers of the senior grade, and master hospital sergeants.

ASSIGNMENT TO SPECIAL DUTIES.

These are the established grades of the enlisted men, but they may variously be assigned to such special duties as chauffeurs, switchboard operators, cobblers, clerks, camoufleurs, sanitary inspectors, draftsmen, stevedores, accountants, plumbers, and such other occupations and trades as are necessary to meet the requirements of Army service.

In addition to the rates of pay for enlisted men heretofore mentioned, supplemental pay or allowances are made as follows:

(1) Increased pay is allowed for continuous service, computed under what is known as "enlistment period." An enlistment period ordinarily represents a period of three or four years, dependent upon the law in effect at date of enlistment. There are seven such periods, covering a period of service of from 1 year to more than 18 years provided for, and the increases range from \$3 to \$24 per month, according to the grade and length of service. Men in the grade of private calling for \$30 per month are increased \$3 per month during the second enlistment period, an additional \$3 during the third enlistment period,

and \$1 per month for each additional enlistment period to include the seventh enlistment period. Men above the \$30 grade and up to and including the \$38 grade are entitled to \$3 per month additional pay for each enlistment period from the second to the seventh for each successive enlistment period. Men above the \$38 grade are entitled to \$4 per month additional pay for each enlistment period from the second to the seventh.

SOME ADDITIONAL RATINGS.

(2) Enlisted men of the Coast Artillery, below the grade of mess sergeant, are entitled to the following additional ratings, according to established individual qualifications: Casement electricians, observers of the first class, plotters, and coxswains, \$9 per month; chief planters, observers of the second class, chief loaders, gun commanders, and gun pointers, \$7 per month; enlisted men of the Field Artillery—expert first class gunners, \$5 per month; first-class gunners, \$3 per month; and second-class gunners, \$2 per month; enlisted men of the Cavalry, Engineers, and Infantry—expert riflemen, \$5 per month; sharpshooters, \$3 per month; and marksmen, \$2 per month; enlisted men of the Medical Department—surgical assistants, \$5 per month; nurse (enlisted man), \$3 per month; and dispensary assistant, \$2 per month.

(3) Enlisted men of the Signal Corps, while on duties which require them to participate regularly in aero flights, assuming that they have rating of aviation mechanic, receive 50 per cent increase in their monthly pay.

HOUSING AND SUBSISTENCE.

(4) All enlisted men, while on detached duty not in the field where there are no Army quarters available, receive in addition to their pay \$15 per month to cover the expense of housing and also a suitable allowance for subsistence and for heat and light.

(5) Enlisted men, if serving in a foreign country or beyond the continental limits of the United States (Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Panama Canal Zone excepted) receive 20 per cent increase in pay computed on the base pay and service pay prevailing prior to June 1, 1917, when an act of Congress increased, for the "term of the emergency," the pay of all enlisted men in amounts ranging from 50 per cent to 8 per cent.

(6) Enlisted men attached to the United States Military Academy are entitled to the same pay and allowances as other enlisted men of the Regular Army of the same grade and additional compensation provided for performing certain duties upon detail therefor in orders.

THE PAY OF OFFICERS.

Officers of the Army are paid according to rank held by them. A second lieutenant receives \$141.67 initial pay per month; first lieutenant, \$166.67; captain, \$200; major, \$250; lieutenant colonel, \$291.67; and a colonel, \$333.33, with an increase of 10 per cent, known as longevity pay, for each period of five years of service, provided that such increase shall not exceed 40 per cent.

The pay of a brigadier general is \$6,000 per year; major general, \$8,000; lieutenant general, \$9,000; and a general, \$10,000. These officers receive no increase for continuous service.

All officers are entitled to be furnished public quarters, with fuel and light, but if these can not be provided the officers receive a commuted money value of the same. The allowance for quarters for a second lieutenant is 2 rooms, or \$24 per month; for a first lieutenant, 3 rooms or commutation of \$36 per month; a captain, 4 rooms or commutation of \$48; major, 5 rooms or commutation of \$60; lieutenant colonel, 6 rooms or commutation of \$72; colonel, 7 rooms or commutation of \$84; brigadier general, 8 rooms or commutation of \$96; major general, 9 rooms or commutation of \$108; lieutenant general, 10 rooms or commutation of \$120; and a general, 11 rooms or a commutation of \$132. All receive a suitable allowance for heat and light, dependent upon the locality of their stations and the season. While on foreign service officers receive an increase of 10 per cent of their base pay and longevity pay.

AERIAL "FLIGHT" INCREASES.

Aviation officers of the Signal Corps, or officers attached to the Signal Corps, while on duty which requires them to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights are entitled to an increase in the pay of their grade under their commissions as follows: Aviation officers, 25 per cent; junior military aviators, 50 per cent; military aviators, 75 per cent. Each junior military aviator and each military aviator duly qualified and serving has the rank, pay, and allowances of one grade higher than that held by them under their commissions, provided that the ranks under their commissions are not higher than that of captain.

For deeds of valor recognized by acts of Congress officers and enlisted men receive certificates of merit, which entitle them to an additional compensation of \$2 per month.

ALLOWANCES AT RETIREMENT.

Enlisted men can apply for retirement after 30 years of service. They are retired on 75 per cent of the monthly pay drawn at the time of retirement and \$15.75 a month additional in lieu of allowances.

Officers are retired for disability or after 64 years of age and receive 75 per cent of the pay of the grade held at date of retirement.

An enlisted man in active service has no necessary personal expenses except for barber and laundry. Uniforms, underclothing, shoes, hats, quarters, medical attendance, and subsistence are supplied them at Government expense. Such materials as tobacco, postage, confectionery, and incidentals of individual taste may be purchased at the post exchange at cost.

Officers while in hospital are charged \$1 per day for subsistence. They are not entitled to clothing or equipment and are required to subsidize themselves, purchasing their supplies either from the quartermaster or through the ordinary channels of trade.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS].

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to what I believe is a very glaring injustice done to rural carriers. As I understand the existing law from the answers made to me by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], city carriers are allowed from \$200 to \$500 a year for the upkeep of their equipment when required to use wagons or automobiles, but the rural carrier is allowed nothing by way of upkeep. It so happens that the reorganization of the rural routes in my district requires every carrier to have two sorts of equipment, an automobile and a team of horses. I am frank to say that the mental operations of the Post Office Department have always been more or less a mystery to me, and I have

never been able to receive any satisfactory explanation of the proposition that it is advisable to grant a city carrier from \$200 to \$500 a year for the upkeep of his equipment that is used on paved streets and allow a rural carrier nothing. It must be patent to anyone who is at all familiar with the conditions that a rural carrier driving country roads in all sorts of weather is more justly entitled to an upkeep and equipment charge than a city carrier, though the city carrier gets little enough. I have in my hand the average upkeep charge of the carriers in my district who are required to operate both an automobile, or rather a Ford, and a team of horses and a wagon, and the average charge in that district is \$241.83 per year for the automobile and \$396 for the team of horses and wagon, or a total upkeep charge of \$637.83, figuring nothing for depreciation. I find in this average charge 410 bushels of grain for the year 1917, amounting to \$287, or a little more than 50 cents a bushel. It can not be purchased to-day for twice that amount. I find a charge of 8 tons of hay at \$12 a ton. It can not be purchased to-day for \$16 a ton. The maximum salary drawn by any of these men is \$1,200 a year, so that more than half the salary is consumed by the upkeep charge the department requires. It seems to me that the United States can not afford to employ men in this character of service where they run anywhere from 18 to 24 miles a day every day in the week, excepting Sunday, over all sorts of country roads, subject to all character of inclement weather, for a net return of less than \$600 a year. I shall at the proper time offer an amendment to remedy this condition, and I trust that it may receive favorable consideration.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN].

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this bill does not provide for a larger increase to the employees, but I am pleased to see that it does one thing that the bill we considered a few days ago providing increases for some of the Government employees did not do. This increase will be added to the amount that the carriers and clerks are receiving now by virtue of the 5 and 10 per cent increase that we intended for the postal employees by the action taken by the Congress last year. I understand that there was a ruling of the Post Office Department that deprived postal clerks of the advantage it was intended that they should have by the action taken a year ago. That was certainly a forced and very harsh ruling and worked a great injustice to postal employees. And I heartily agree with the remarks made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] to the effect that common justice would dictate an allowance to rural carriers for upkeep of equipment. In my district many of them are compelled to keep double equipment—an automobile for a part of the year and horses for the remainder of the year. They can not dispose of one when they are using the other. It is necessary for them to keep both and the upkeep of all their equipment depletes their salaries to a point at which the Government ought not to ask any one to work. We heard a good deal sometime ago about the efforts of the Committee on Appropriations; that it was preparing a bill to provide increases for clerks, and we expected a bill that would provide reasonable increases. In my judgment the increases carried by that bill were not reasonable; the increases were all less than they should have been; and I regret that the increases provided by this bill are not larger.

Several gentlemen have spoken of the need of increases of salaries of rural carriers and of proper allowance for expenses—spoken better than I am able—so I shall not occupy time along that line. I am allowed only a minute or two more and I wish to urge additional increases—more than this bill provides—for clerks and janitors. There are too many low-salaried clerks; too many clerks, capable, faithful, long in the service, who are receiving and even if this bill becomes law will receive salaries much too small. In very few cases does the Postal Service provide liberal salaries, but perhaps liberality can not be expected of the Post Office Department.

There certainly should be reasonable compensation for all employees, but this can not be said as to many of the clerks, nor can it be said as to janitors. Compensation of these places ought to be materially increased and now is the time for such increases. Additional compensation carried by this bill would be low even in normal times; during these times of abnormal expense of living refusal of larger increases is a great injustice to capable and deserving employees. I trust the committee and the House will promptly act with some measure of justice toward these men. Lack of time does not permit me to speak of other sections of the bill relating to compensation of men in other branches of the Postal Service.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish in this general debate to express my approval of the purposes of this bill. I should like to see it enacted into law at the earliest date possible. It has been delayed too long. It should have been passed long ago. Congress has been derelict in its duty. But it is better late than never. So I am glad that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has at last brought before the House a bill to increase the salaries and pay of postal employees. I am glad that its benefits extend to railway mail clerks, clerks in all post offices, city carriers, postmasters, including those in fourth-class offices, and among all there are none more deserving of the increase than the rural-route carriers.

While approving the bill in general, I have some criticisms to offer:

The first is this: The increase in pay provided is not permanent. The increase of pay, as the terms of the bill provide, shall continue only "for and during the period of the war and for 90 days thereafter," as determined by the proclamation of the President. I can not understand why the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads concluded to place this limit in the bill. I can not understand upon what basis the committee reached this conclusion. The increase is not large. It is very moderate. It should, therefore, have been made permanent. The department is constantly in need of new men for this service. The fact that the increased pay is only temporary will not tend to attract good, reliable new men into the service. More than that, it is unjust to the men in the service. They are left in a state of doubt and uncertainty. They will not know how long the increased pay is to last, and, very naturally, this will be unsatisfactory. According to the showing which has been made to me, especially as to the pay received by rural-route carriers, they are entitled to an increase of pay entirely independent of the continuation of the war. Their pay is too small for times of peace. The same may be said of the compensation of postmasters in fourth-class offices. For many years they have not received pay corresponding to the important service they have been rendering or sufficient to adequately compensate them for the work required of them.

The same may be said of the great majority of the postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, their clerks, railway mail clerks, and city carriers. The increased pay granted in this bill seems to have been based by the committee solely upon the increased cost of living as the result of the war. But the percentage of increased pay is much less than the percentage of increase in the cost of living since the beginning of the war. In other words, the increase in pay provided in this bill is not at all commensurate with the advance in the cost of living since the beginning of the war. The committee has not, therefore, done full justice to the various classes of post-office employees.

The increased pay is to stop within 90 days after the close of the war. This is not right. If there is to be any limit at all, it should be much longer than 90 days. It should not be less than one year, and, in my judgment, should be much longer than that. The 90-day limit is wholly illogical. The committee certainly knows that there can be and will be no material reduction in the cost of living within 90 days after the close of the war. It may take years before prices will get down to the level of peace times. Indeed, I have seen it stated by numerous prominent people that food products and other things in common use will remain high a number of years after the war closes. This may be a matter of guesswork.

But we do know that prices will not drop down to a peace basis within 90 days after the close of the war. We are gradually adjusting ourselves to war prices. The tendency is to reach an equilibrium in prices of all the various articles in common use. That can not be accomplished in a day. The same process will go on in the adjustment of prices after the war. It is therefore illogical to base an increase of pay upon increased cost of living and discontinue the increased pay before there can possibly be any appreciable decrease in the cost of living. Still, this is what the committee bill does. It ought to be amended in this respect.

The war conditions have been exceptionally burdensome upon rural route carriers. They have a double burden to bear. Their ordinary living expenses have increased, the same as other employees of the Post Office Department; but in addition to this they have a team to feed or an auto to keep up. They have an equipment to purchase, maintain, and operate. The cost of horses, vehicles, autos, feed, and the cost of maintenance and operation have all increased heavily. All this means just that much reduction in their salaries. The burden upon them is heavy, indeed.

There are 43,318 rural-route carriers in the United States. They deliver daily mail to more than 27,000,000 of our people.

They are, as a rule, high-grade, intelligent, faithful, and patriotic public servants. Upon them rests the responsibility of performing a very important part of the public service. The pay they receive should be such as will attract to and hold in this service men who are capable of rendering the most efficient and satisfactory service. Mr. Chairman, it would be poor policy to keep the compensation of rural carriers so low as to drive capable men from the service. This danger must be avoided. Finally, we must not overlook the fact that the great agricultural interests are involved in this proposition. The rural carriers serve the farmers. They constitute one-third of our population. As never before this war has brought home to us the importance of the expansion of our agricultural interests. To do this we must, among other things, make the farm attractive.

The American farmers are intelligent. They demand good mail service. To this they are entitled. Any deterioration in the mail service for the rural districts would be a hindrance to agricultural development, and in this way unfavorably affect our national strength.

I believe we have the best postal system in the world. Our policy should be to improve it all along the line. Let us give adequate pay to all our postmasters in the large and small offices, to our clerks in all grades and divisions of the service, to our railway mail clerks, whose duties are most important and hazardous, to both our city and rural carriers, and to all, however humble they may be, who contribute to the success of our great Postal Service.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS].

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I vote most earnestly, heartily, and willingly for this bill. The only objection or criticism I have of it is that it does not grant a sufficient increase of pay to the rural carriers. [Applause.] In western Pennsylvania and through that part of the United States located in that latitude, these carriers must not only have one horse but they must have two horses, and if they have an automobile they must maintain also two horses and wagon and an automobile. Now, to maintain that sort of equipment, and I have here the statistics from the various carriers throughout the twenty-second district of Pennsylvania, showing that it costs them over \$50 a month to maintain two horses and vehicle, and over \$60 a month to maintain an automobile, leaving less than \$40 a month upon which to support themselves and their family, so that the Government is not paying these men a sufficient sum to enable them to maintain themselves, educate their children, and live respectably, according to the American standard of living, under this scale of wages.

This bill is entitled "A bill granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and Postal Service." It deals first with rural carriers, and grants an increase of 15 per cent to all those receiving \$1,200 per year or less, and \$24 per mile for each mile traveled over 24 miles, which is established as a rural-mail route, so that the carrier who serves a route 30 miles in length will receive \$1,320 per year hereafter. This is a substantial advance in pay. The suburban carriers are given, in addition to this advance, an allowance for the upkeep of their conveyances. There is no reason why such aid should not be given the rural carriers, who have rougher roads and greater distances to contend with, and I shall at the proper time move an amendment to this bill granting an allowance of \$25 per month to each rural-mail carrier toward paying the cost of the conveyance he must use in his service in carrying the mails. This is right and just, and should be granted to these faithful employees of the Government.

The bill also grants an advance to the clerks and all other employees in first and second class post offices. These increases are proper, and when it is remembered that this is the first increase of pay granted since 1907, it will be readily understood for what inadequate pay these employees are now working. The cost of the necessities of life are now from 100 to 400 per cent higher than they were when their present wage scale was established. The third-class offices are not referred to in this bill for the reason that the pay of the employees in post offices of this class is left entirely by existing law in the hands of the Postmaster General, and it is fair to assume that he will fix the compensation of all these employees on relatively the same basis that this bill fixes the employees of second-class offices.

The bill establishes an eight-hour day for all employees in the Postal Service. This is a great and substantial benefit to these now overworked public servants. Fourth-class postmasters are by this bill given all cancellations up to \$100 per quarter, or at least \$400 per year when the cancellations equal

that sum. A very proper recompense for this class of postal employees, who not only do all the work but furnish the building, together with light and heat free to the Government.

Another very just provision of this bill is that contained in section 4, which allows the Postmaster General to relieve star route and screen wagon carriers from the hardship of contracts entered into before prices advanced, which now render further compliance with their contracts impossible without great financial loss. I know men in my district, Mr. Chairman, who will be bankrupt unless the relief here given can be invoked. As well might we expect a man to pay rent on a house that had burned down as to carry out a contract made in 1914 on the basis of the prices then prevailing. This great Government is not unjust. It does not ask for the "pound of flesh."

There is one great omission, however, in this legislation. The Postmaster General, in his annual report, page 25, in referring to the act of 1917, which establishes a new system of accounting, whereby the accounts of the small offices are all kept in the larger ones, instead of in the department at Washington, says:

Under this statute the smaller post offices, known as district offices, now obtain their postage stamps and supplies and render their accounts through a central accounting postmaster in each county.

This is a new feature. An entire change. A vast amount of additional work is, by this method, imposed on the postmasters of the county-seat post offices. No provision is made to pay for this new work. The already overworked postmasters of these accounting offices must do all this work and keep all these accounts without any pay therefor. This is unfair and unjust. I should like to know whether there is a reduction in the force here in Washington by reason of this shift of work? There are in Westmoreland County, Pa., 114 post offices and 53 rural routes and in Butler County, Pa., 46 post offices and 62 rural routes—in 1916—in my congressional district. Yet the postmasters at Greensburg, Pa., and Butler, Pa., must keep the accounts with these offices without any extra pay for the services rendered.

This is an unjust burden, and I shall try to amend this bill to correct this wrong. If the post office is now self-sustaining and indeed profitable, as the Postmaster General claims it is, why continue these pinching economies and unfair practices? Let us aim, gentlemen, by this law to do justice to all the employees of the great Post Office Service wherever found or in whatever capacity they serve.

The post office is the great educational branch of our Government. The daily visit of the citizen to the post office or the coming of the rural carrier to his door is about the only evidence he has in a tangible way of the benefits of the General Government.

May we not fondly hope that our postal department may hereafter be regarded by our citizens not only as a dispenser of knowledge but as a great public institution that treats equitably, justly, and liberally its faithful employees from the humblest to the highest alike.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] sufficient time to make a request.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with the propositions embodied in this legislation and am happy at the opportunity afforded me by voice and vote to favor the reclassification of the grades of the clerks and carriers in first and second class post offices and in the Railway Mail Service, so that the long-serving, experienced, faithful, and hard-working men shall receive the additional financial reward to which they are so justly entitled. I am also in full sympathy with the increase for the other employees of the post office and the rural mail carriers.

The cost of maintaining the equipment of the rural carrier, whether motor or horse power, has become so great that their salaries have been depleted to a point that leaves them a bare sum for subsistence. Contrary to the views of many, the cost of this upkeep of vehicles, horses, or motor cars and the purchase price of the same is entirely paid from the salaries of the rural carriers, for which no allowance is made by the Government. As a result of this burden of expense on the rural carrier five appointments have been made on one route in one year in the district which I have the honor to represent.

It is a pleasure also for me to support the appropriation for experiments in the motor-truck delivery of food products suggested by Fourth Assistant Postmaster General Blasklee. Indeed, Mr. Blasklee has already demonstrated by experimental parcel-post motor-truck routes now in operation that the experimental stage has been passed and that this service, where rendered, is not only an undoubted success, but that its possibilities for the benefit of the people are almost incalculable.

One of the great weaknesses to-day is the lack of transportation facilities. Great quantities of food may be grown and a large output made of manufactures, but they are of no avail unless they are gotten to the markets and the consumers. Vast quantities of corn remain in the bins of the farmer in the West that are needed in the East. Early vegetables by the thousands of tons are ready in the South and wanted in the North. Lack of transportation is the obstacle in the way, and an unnecessarily higher cost of living the result.

It was not the lack of coal during the recent hard winter that caused such hardship, but the inability to place the coal where it was needed. I cite these as instances of conditions in food products and other material things that have affected nearly every part of our country for some years and aggravated by war conditions. They must be remedied not only to lessen the burden upon the people, but to enable us to win the fearful war in which we are engaged. The development of the parcel post truck-line system and extension of these routes throughout the country will be a tremendous factor in the improvement of these serious conditions.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] sufficient time to make a request.

Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the mere fact that since 1907 there has not been any change in the pay of postal employees except in 1912, when the compensation of men in the first grade was made \$800 per annum instead of \$600, takes the question of now increasing their salaries out of the debatable zone, in my opinion.

This bill is the outgrowth of an exhaustive investigation by the committee reporting it, and it is here for approval or disapproval. Information concerning it has come to me in various ways—verbally, by written communications, and by investigations—and two facts are apparent.

First. There appears to be influential opposition to its passage.

Second. There is a widespread popular demand that salaries ought to be regraded and increased.

The opposition, in part, condemns the methods used to secure results; that is, through employees' organizations, unions.

In a departmental report commenting on these organizations, their journals, and conventions it is asserted that they "are devoted almost entirely to matters of selfish interest" and that "the organized postal employees are making many selfish demands"; that these organizations "are fast becoming a menace to public welfare and should no longer be tolerated or condoned"; and furthermore that "the interests of the employee will always be protected by public sentiment."

Criticisms made and suggestions offered, after a full, unprejudiced, and intelligent investigation, are entitled to consideration, may be reviewed, and this, too, without reflecting on motive.

These organizations will in their own way and in due time answer all these statements. Personally the one that interests me greatly is the one that public sentiment will protect the employee. How is public sentiment created? How is it made effective? The answer is obvious: Through organizations; there is not much accomplished these days without them.

Lawyers have their bar associations and, in some instances, fix their minimum fees.

Doctors have their county organizations, establish standards of professional ethics, and regulate charges. School-teachers unionize for the betterment of themselves.

In all the arts and crafts, industries, and commercial activities there are organizations.

There are scientific, literary, religious, labor, employers, aye, and political and partisan organizations. How do we hold our seats here? By party organization. What are we; what is our status? We surely are not officers within the exempting clause of the war-revenue bill. We may be "Federal employees." If so, must not our organized political work cease? If continued, it may become a menace to public welfare.

Recently Members on both side of this House earnestly contended that they and others were bound by party platforms. If true, it is important. Let me apply it. These carriers are wage earners, are they not?

In a national platform of 1912 we find this:

There should be no abridgment of the right of wage earners and producers to organize.

And in fulfillment thereof was there not in 1914 enacted legislation limiting the operation of restraining orders in injunctions? And in the platform of 1916 is there not reference to all this, and a reaffirmation of it in these words:

We have secured to the workman the right of voluntary association for his protection and welfare.

All other organizations are permissible, it is said, but men and women who are Federal employees, and especially post-office employees, must not organize to reach desired results.

It seems to me that they come within the scope of their constitutional privileges vouchsafed in the first constitutional amendment, passed September 26, 1789, at the first session of the First Congress—the right “to assemble and to petition for a redress of grievances.”

At all events they have been doing so for a long time. Growing out of their agitation and discussions, a meeting was held at Milwaukee in 1889, and the next year what might be called their first national convention was held at Boston, Mass. What did the delegates do? They discussed their grievances, and a petition was sent to Washington, bearing 50,000 names. Result: Relief prayed for.

At the present time there are many organizations of Federal employees: International Typographical Union, International Printing Pressmen's Union, Stereotypers' and Electrotypers' Union, International Brotherhood of Bookbinders, International Association of Machinists, Patternmakers' League, International Molders' Union, Steel Plate Framers' Association, Plate Engravers, and not even one strike. Postal employees—I do not know when or where or to what extent, if any, governmental efficiency has been impaired by them. As near as I can learn, they have conducted themselves in a law-abiding, peaceful, and orderly manner. If there has been bloodshed, force, or rioting, or serious injury to the service, we ought to know it, and then “public sentiment” might prevent a recurrence.

The method used to create public sentiment and grant relief is secondary and of little importance in passing on this bill. It is merit and not method that should guide us.

Has the pending measure any merit? The postal carriers must live decently, must pay their bills; they are temperate, frugal, and trustworthy; they perform their daily tasks punctually, braving the storms of winter and enduring the excessive heat of summer; they are not wealthy; their character is good; their service of great public benefit, invaluable; most of them have families to support, children to feed, clothe, and educate; they are human, like the rest of us, and enjoy, as we do, something over and beyond the absolute necessities of life, but their indulgence is greatly restricted or altogether eliminated.

Their qualifications, their service, their wants and necessities demand a decent compensation, and this is not to be determined by comparisons, by what some others may receive in another kind of governmental work.

It is a separate and distinct proposition, apart from all others. We have Biblical authority that the workman is worthy of his wage. What shall it be? How are wages to be fixed?

Honesty, experience, efficiency, the kind of work performed, skill, intelligence, the cost of living are factors to be considered in determining what is a just compensation, and this should not be limited to barely enough to eke out an existence.

Those postal carriers, clerks, janitors, all are faithful public employees. I think it was stated at one of the hearings before the committee having the bill in charge and by one of the Assistant Postmasters General in substance that they were as fine a body of men as could be found in Government service.

We personally know the character of these men; that it is good. We are familiar with their duties. A knowledge of what their wants and necessities are we acquire from varied sources.

I read with absorbing interest parts of the printed reports of the hearings, and gained useful information by so doing, both as to the attitude of the Post Office Department and the merits of the contemplated legislation. The testimony presented led me into the homes of these employees. I learned something of their lives and their families. If I did not have evidence from any other source, I found enough to convince me that their claims are just. I was somewhat confused by statements in the department's report of 1917 and in the reports of the hearings with reference to the increase of pay for the postal employees.

The First Assistant Postmaster General states the policy of the department on page 231 of the December, 1917-January, 1918, hearings to be the “effort of the department to fix the standard rates of pay for the different classes of work at from 15 per cent to 30 per cent above the average rates paid for similar service by the leading commercial institutions of the country,” as set forth in the department's report for the fiscal year of 1916, and adds that “the same policy was outlined last year before the legislative committee during the hearings on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bills,” and is the policy now. Very well, let it be so. Let it become effective and not merely an intent.

The Fourth Assistant Postmaster General says, “If the employees at this time are not compensated at 15 per cent above the

salaries paid by private employers for work of as exacting character, we are willing to recommend any increase that will bring them up to that basis. We are not opposing any increase in the salaries of postal employees”—see page 270 of the hearing. I said in the beginning that there is a wide-spread popular demand for an increase. I am justified in this from the fact that nearly 150 Members of this House, representing approximately 40 States, appeared before the committee and expressed themselves in favor of an increase. These Members reflect the sentiment of thousands of their constituents.

Now, what do we find? The department, through its chosen spokesmen, favors an increase. The employees have asked for it. A fair proportion of this House are for it. All there is left is to put the bill through. The only question is, What shall that increase be? I fear that the bill does not provide enough. On that subject I have some evidence that may be useful.

Desirous of securing first-hand information, I formed some questions and sent them out for answers and received several replies, all of the same tenor. The following will be sufficient to show the inadequacy of present pay:

STATEMENT OF A RURAL CARRIER.

Statement of Arthur A. Sedgwick:
What is your salary? \$1,200.
Do you own a house? Yes; 40-acre farm.
What is it worth? \$3,000.
What taxes do you pay? \$35.
If you rent, how much do you pay per month?
What is your yearly expense for clothes, shoes, etc.? \$200.
How many children have you living with you? One.
How many and who are they in your family whom you have to support? Wife, one child, and my father 87 years old.
What does your fuel cost per year? \$90. Light? \$12.
What does your food for family cost per year? \$300.
What do your subscriptions for papers and magazines cost per year? \$10.
What is your yearly church expenses? \$75.
Do any members of your family contribute anything for family expenses? No. If so, how much?
How many contribute? None.
How many of your children go to school? One.
How old are your children? One child, 16 years.
How many horses have you? Two.
What are the horses worth? \$225.
Cost per month or year for their feed? \$428 per year.
Cost per month or year for shoeing? \$50 per year.
Detail expenses—that is, give items concerning these expenses?
Oats, hay, straw, horse tonic.
Cost of vehicle? \$85. Repairs per year? \$50 per year.
Who bears the expense of the outfit and keep? I do.
State any other expenses you have. Doctor bills; go to see my friends once in a while; and use a little gasoline.

Signed by ARTHUR A. SEDGWICK.

If I didn't have a farm to work from 4 o'clock in the morning till 8 at night I would run behind.

ARTHUR A. SEDGWICK.

STATEMENT OF CITY CARRIER.

Statement of Charles H. Burger:
What is your salary? \$1,200 per year.
Do you own a house? Yes.
What is it worth? \$3,000.
What taxes do you pay? \$26.90.
If you rent, how much do you pay per month?
What is your yearly expense for clothes, shoes, etc.? \$261.
How many children have you living with you? Three.
How many and who are they in your family whom you have to support? Four—wife and three children.
What does your fuel cost per year? \$75. Light? \$10.
What does your food for family cost per year? \$624.
What do your subscriptions for papers, etc., cost per year? \$5.
What is your yearly church expense? \$20.
Do any of your family contribute anything for family expense? No.
If so, how much?
How many contribute? None.
How many of your children go to school? None.
How old are your children? Twins, 3½ years; baby, 18 months.
State any other expenses you have. Interest on property mortgage, \$138; fire insurance, \$5; life insurance, \$70; water rent, \$17; dentist and doctor bills, \$30.

Signed by CHARLES H. BURGER.

One other similar report carefully analyzed shows that the amount of pay devoted to food for the family allowed each member 7 cents per meal.

The rural carrier has a laborious task to perform. He is a post office on wheels or runners. He has to perform many duties—make change for postage, carry parcels, and do his work regardless of snow-bound or well-nigh impassable mud roads.

The services of the city carrier are indispensable. Both classes are patriotic, and desire to subscribe for liberty bonds, to the Red Cross funds, and other war activities. How can they do it? They can not do much now. Their salaries have been in effect cut in two; they have been subjected to meatless, wheatless, and sweetless days, and to some extent to in part eatless days.

It has been said that the proposed increase will require a large amount of money. Suppose it does; men have got to live,

and these men are rendering full service for what they may receive.

I would cut out from the bill the time limitation and make the increase permanent.

The service is now being crippled because men are leaving it to receive better compensation elsewhere. The Postal Service should be kept up to the highest standard; its functions are most useful whether regarded as a commercial utility or an educational one.

Mr. Chairman, the men whose duty it is to deliver the mails must be well cared for. Their burdens are growing, both in the service and in the cost of supporting their families. The increased cost of living is phenomenal and unparalleled. I venture to prophesy that there will not be a dissenting voice in the passage of this bill, because it is so meritorious and appeals so strongly to our sense of justice.

Mr. STEENERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. EVANS].

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I am in sympathy with the principle of this bill. There are, however, glaring inconsistencies in the measure that should be corrected. The first paragraph of the bill limits the increase of pay to the rural carriers to a period of time extending 90 days after the termination of the war, while, if my interpretation of the language of the bill is correct, the pay herein provided for city delivery carriers and other postal employees is made permanent. I am personally of the opinion that this whole measure should be made a permanent law, and we would thus avoid being called upon every year to make an increase for the employees of the Government. A few days ago we passed in this House a measure carrying an increase to certain of the employees of the Government, which increase ranged from 25 per cent to those drawing very low salaries down to 6 per cent to those drawing \$2,000 per annum. I had the honor to be a member of the subcommittee that reported that bill. While that matter was under consideration before us there was much diversity of opinion as to the increase that should be made. Personally I voted for an increase of \$15 a month, or \$180 a year, to each of the 200,000 employees involved in that bill.

It was, however, the judgment of the committee, after much consideration, that \$120 per annum, or \$10 a month, should be granted. While I thought the amount too small, I gave the measure my hearty support, because I thought it was a step in the right direction; and I feel, Mr. Chairman, that the present bill is a step in the right direction, though I do not deem it adequate to meet the situation. It is true this bill will entail an outlay to the Government of about \$30,000,000, which, with the \$29,000,000 voted in the bill we passed a few days ago, seems a very large increase in the pay of Government employees. When you consider that these two bills affect at least 440,000 employees, the increase per man is not very great. I have always maintained that as a rule, speaking by and large, the Government employee is the poorest paid person in the land considering his experience and qualifications. On the other hand, it is my judgment that the Government should be a model employer and should not ask men to work for a wage on which a self-respecting man can not live and support his family. Any industry, any institution, any economical system, or any government that denies to its employees such a reward is unjust and indefensible. It is my judgment that the allowance provided in this bill for rural carriers is wholly inadequate, and while it is a material increase over the present pay I do not believe Congress can justify itself in asking these men to render the service they do, under the conditions imposed upon them, for the pay herein granted, much less their present compensation.

In answer to a question submitted to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], I understood him to say that city carriers are allowed from two to four hundred dollars a year for the upkeep of their equipment, when required to use wagons or automobiles, but that rural carriers are made no such allowance for the upkeep of their equipment. To me that is a glaring defect either on the part of Congress or on the part of the Post Office Department. I can not understand why a carrier whose equipment is used only on city streets, which are generally paved or kept in good condition, should be allowed compensation, while the rural carrier, who must use his vehicles on country roads, should be denied such an allowance, and if the opportunity presents itself in further consideration of this bill tomorrow I hope to offer an amendment to remedy that defect.

It must be apparent to anyone at all familiar with the conditions that a rural carrier must meet that he is more justly entitled to an upkeep allowance than is a city carrier, and by that I do not mean to say that the city carrier is not entitled to this allowance; on the contrary, I believe he is, but I believe the rural carrier is entitled to a larger allowance for such upkeep, and, as I understand the matter, now he gets none.

The present law allows the rural carrier \$1,200 a year. He is compelled to provide his own equipment, which often consists of one or two horses and a wagon and an automobile. Figures have been submitted to this House showing that the average charge for the upkeep of a team of horses and a wagon is \$250 a year, and for an automobile more than \$350 a year, figuring nothing for depreciation. That allows the man for his services less than \$600 a year. These men work six days in the week. They make their route of from 20 to 30 miles every day regardless of the inclemency of the weather, and we ask them to accept from us a pitiful sum of \$50 a month net on which to live and support their families. This bill, if it passes, will increase that allowance to some extent but still does not give them adequate compensation. I hope this bill will be amended to increase the compensation particularly to rural carriers, and that it will be amended in such a manner as to make it a permanent law and when so amended will pass.

More than 200,000 employees are affected by this bill, and there are no more loyal or efficient employees in the world than this 200,000. Upon them rests the responsibility of performing a very important part of the public service, and they are entitled to receive such compensation as will attract and hold capable people in the service. The American people are probably the most discriminating people in the world. They demand good mail service as they demand good service in every other line, and they are entitled to it. We probably have the best Postal Service System in the world, and our policy should be to improve it. It is not a money-making scheme, and the pittance that we save by denying to these employees adequate compensation for this work reflects no credit upon the Government or the American people. For these and many other reasons that I might state I am earnestly in favor of the passage of this measure.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, how much time has the gentleman from Minnesota left?

The CHAIRMAN. He has none.

Mr. MOON. How much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. Two minutes.

Mr. MOON. I yield a minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, on the 14th of December, 1917, I inserted in the RECORD in connection with the amendment which I offered to the Post Office appropriation bill, a statement showing the increased cost of living from 1914 to 1917, and for the purpose of getting these facts and figures in their proper place in the RECORD here in the consideration of this bill I ask unanimous consent that those remarks incorporated at that time be incorporated in the RECORD now in this connection. At the same time I wish to have incorporated in the RECORD the statement made by J. W. Whitfield, president of the Old Dutch Market, showing the increased cost of living within the last year, which statement will show the necessity for the increase of the compensation of the rural free-delivery carriers, the post-office clerks, letter carriers, and fourth-class postmasters.

HOW FOOD PRICES HAVE ADVANCED HERE DURING THE LAST FOUR YEARS.

Statistical testimony regarding the increased cost of living on the commodities which Government workers must buy in order to live was given by J. W. Whitfield, president of the Old Dutch Market (Inc.).

Mr. Whitfield recited the prices on a list of 61 commodities under the heading, "Grocery, beef, pork, and vegetables," giving the prices for December, 1914, 1915, 1916, and 1917. He pointed out that the average increase on all items in this list for the three-year period from 1914 to 1917 was 92.1 per cent. The average increase for the two-year period, 1915 to 1917, was 98.6 per cent. The average increase for the one year, December, 1916, to December, 1917, was 55.6 per cent.

Mr. Whitfield explained that while these figures are for December, 1917, they are in all reasonable probability averaging as high, if not higher, to-day.

GROCERIES GO UP 90.1 PER CENT.

He showed that the average increase on all items in the list of groceries for the three-year period was 90.1 per cent; for the two-year period, 76.6 per cent; and for last year alone, 44.4 per cent. He said that 58 per cent of the total increase from December, 1914, to December, 1917, was put on during 1917.

In regard to all items under the heading of beef, he said that the average increase for the three-year period was 55.6 per cent, for the last two years 62.6 per cent, and for last year alone 63.3 per cent. Mr. Whitfield pointed out that prices were lower in 1915 and 1916 than in 1914, and that the increase during the last year was very radical on these products.

In discussing pork products, Mr. Whitfield said the average increase on all items shown on his list for the three-year period was 104 per cent, for the two-year period 118 per cent, and that over 60 per cent of the total increase was put on in 1917.

Regarding butter, eggs, and cheese, Mr. Whitfield figured the average increase on all items for the three-year period, 44.2 per cent; for the two years 1915 to 1917, 51.4 per cent; and for last year alone, 21.4 per cent. He said the prices were lower in 1915 and 1916, and the general increase has been about the same for the last two years.

VEGETABLES UP 200 PER CENT.

The average increase on vegetables during the three years, he said, had been 200 per cent. From 1915 to 1917 it was 228 per cent and last year alone it was 79.3 per cent.

He said the advance on vegetables had been the most radical in the business. He invited special attention to the prices on potatoes and cabbages. His table showed that potatoes sold in 1914 for 15 cents a peck, in 1915 for 23 cents, in 1916 for 50 cents, and in 1917 for 38 cents. The price on cabbage in 1914 was one-half cent a pound; in 1915, 1 cent a pound; and for the last two years, 4 cents a pound.

Mr. Whitfield argued that these advances in prices for foodstuffs, coupled with similar advances for clothing, shoes, and other necessities, make it impossible for the low-salaried Government employees to meet necessary expenses. In reply to a number of questions he said that as his concern sells directly to thousands of Government employees he has first-hand information regarding how hard it is for them to make their salaries cover the needs of life.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Dec. 14, 1917.]

Mr. WATKINS. I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. WATKINS: Page 23, line 9, after the word 'thereof,' strike out '\$53,000,000' and insert '\$66,250,000.'"

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the proposition of increasing the pay of rural free-delivery carriers when the bill was under general debate the statement was made on the floor that a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads was investigating the question so as to determine as to what would be a reasonable amount to add to the compensation of the rural free-delivery carriers as well as post-office clerks. The gentleman from Indiana, in discussing that question, intimated very strongly that in all probability if any increase was allowed it would not be more than 15 per cent. This amendment calls for an increase of 25 per cent. I have carefully estimated the expenses of the rural free-delivery carriers, and I am satisfied that no increase of less than 25 per cent will be adequate. I have made a compilation of figures, showing not only the living expenses of the rural free-delivery carriers but also their expenses incident to the maintenance and upkeep of their vehicles—whether motor propelled or horse drawn—and the expense of maintaining the animals when they have to use horse-drawn vehicles. These figures show that foodstuffs have increased from 50 to 200 per cent in three years; gasoline, 100 per cent; provisions, as follows:

	1914	1917
Bacon.....per pound.....	\$0.20	\$0.45
Ham.....do.....	.18	.35
Lard.....do.....	.08	.23
Macaroni.....do.....	.07	.12
Cheese.....do.....	.18	.35
Butter.....do.....	.25	.50
Flour.....do.....	.04	.97
Sugar.....do.....	.05	.10
Onions.....do.....	.03	.03
Rice.....do.....	.07	.10
Grits.....do.....	.03	.03
Black-eyed peas.....do.....	.07	.12
Codfish.....do.....	.15	.24
Bread.....do.....	.05	.10
Beef (fresh).....do.....	.17	.35
Pork (fresh).....do.....	.20	.40
Irish potatoes.....per peck.....	.22	.53
Sweet potatoes.....do.....	.30	.45
Eggs.....per dozen.....	.25	.45
Tomatoes.....per can.....	.08	.12
Sirup.....per gallon.....	.65	.90

Laborers' wages have increased 100 per cent. The price of cotton and other agricultural products having increased in like proportion, there is a great inducement for rural free-delivery carriers to engage in other vocations.

This same statement applies in reference to letter carriers, as well as to rural free-delivery carriers, except as to stock, feed, and gasoline. I regard an increase of 25 per cent for rural free-delivery carriers as most reasonable and just, and insist that the amendment do pass.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I presume that my friend from Louisiana is not serious in offering this amendment. His amendment increases the appropriation \$16,000,000. That is a question that ought to be and will be considered very carefully by the committee and a report made before passed on by the House. His proposition does not go to the extent of increasing the salaries or furnishing pay for equipment to rural carriers, but just adds \$16,000,000 to the general appropriation, which could not possibly be used, if the amendment were passed, under the present law without an increase of the salaries and allowances for equipment. It seems to me that it is entirely useless to increase the gross sum of appropriations when there is no law to authorize its application anywhere. It would be an idle thing on the part of the House, and I presume the gentleman only offered it for the purpose of submitting some remarks and not with the idea that it would be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HELM. There were three hours allowed for general debate on this bill. I would like to inquire how much of that time was consumed by those opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair does not know.

Mr. HELM. Let us make it a personal inquiry, then. Was there any time allotted to those who were opposed to the bill?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me I will state to the gentleman from Kentucky that the time was to be equally divided between those who were for the bill and those who were

against it. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] had the time for those who were against the bill.

Mr. HELM. I understand that application was made of him by the gentlemen opposed to the bill, and they were unable to secure time. I was advised the gentleman from Georgia requested time and was told that all the time was allotted.

Mr. MOON. Time on this side was allotted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for and during the period of the war and for 90 days after the proclamation of peace by the President the increased allowance for postal employees in addition to the compensation now received by them shall be as follows:

That carriers in the Rural Free Delivery Service shall receive 15 per cent per annum up to and including those receiving \$1,200 per annum and \$24 per mile per annum for each additional mile over 24 miles.

That after the passage of this act clerks in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall be divided into six grades, as follows: First grade, salary \$1,000; second grade, salary \$1,100; third grade, salary \$1,200; fourth grade, salary \$1,300; fifth grade, salary \$1,400; sixth grade, salary \$1,500. Clerks and carriers shall be promoted successively to the sixth grade.

That hereafter the salaries of railway postal clerks shall be graded as follows: Grade 1 at \$1,100; grade 2 at \$1,200; grade 3 at \$1,300; grade 4 at \$1,400; grade 5 at \$1,500; grade 6 at \$1,600; grade 7 at \$1,700; grade 8 at \$1,800; grade 9 at \$1,900; grade 10 at \$2,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CARAWAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9414) granting increased compensation to certain officials, employees, and laborers in the Post Office Department and the Postal Service, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken on this bill may have leave to revise and extend their remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee—

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. How about those who have not?

Mr. MOON. I will amend that so as to ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who may desire to do so may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all those who may desire to do so may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the Record on this bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, March 22, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. TILLMAN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10924) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 398), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolution, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 10925) to furnish all uniforms, accouterments, and equipments required for any officer of the military forces of the United States at cost prices; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 10926) authorizing and directing the President to fix the prices for gasoline, kerosene, and other fuel oils, and to provide for the regulation of the production, storage, and sale of same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 10927) to authorize and empower the Secretary of the Navy to enter into and contract for the construction of a water-pipe line from a point in the city of Port Angeles, Wash., to the Navy submarine base on Ediz Hook; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 10928) to amend sections 10 and 37 of the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 10929) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Cal.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 10930) for the inclusion of certain lands in the Wyoming National Forest, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. FLOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 291) for the consideration of S. 1553; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, requesting the President and the Congress to devise and enact measures for the drafting of aliens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: Memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, requesting the President and the Congress to devise and enact measures for the drafting of aliens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAGUE: Memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, requesting the President and the Congress to devise and enact measures for the drafting of aliens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TILLMAN: A bill (H. R. 10924) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee of the Whole House.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 10931) granting a pension to Frederick Munzer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10932) granting a pension to Laura D. Bricker; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 10933) granting a pension to Mary Calkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10934) granting a pension to Fountain Tankersley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10935) granting a pension to Mollie Hoover; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10936) granting a pension to Ollie H. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10937) granting a pension to John C. Ferneding; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10938) granting an increase of pension to Fannie H. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10939) for the relief of Henry C. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10940) granting a pension to Denton Whipples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 10941) granting a pension to Eliza J. St. Clair; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 10942) granting a pension to William A. Hartley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 10943) granting an increase of pension to Carrie E. Dennis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Miss RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 10944) granting a pension to Annie Veuve; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10945) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. McIntire; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 10946) granting a pension to Myrtle Collier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 10947) granting a pension to Carl P. Biehler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10948) granting a pension to Vinton Myrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10949) granting an increase of pension to William H. Beal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10950) granting a pension to Thomas R. Tracy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 10951) granting an increase of pension to George W. Burchard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10952) granting an increase of pension to William A. Byus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Resolution of the National Woman's Party, Pennsylvania Branch, urging that Congress investigate the conduct of the officials of the District of Columbia who endeavored to coerce women trying to secure suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREW: Resolution of the Practitioners' Society of New York, indorsing the Owen bill (S. 3748) and the Dyer bill (H. R. 9563); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of H. Planten & Son, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the payment of the excess-profits tax in installments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON: Resolutions adopted by the Joint Fish Commission, representing Oakland, Berkeley, Alameda, Richmond, and other cities on the east side of San Francisco Bay, requesting Federal action to reduce the price and increase the supply of fish; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EVANS: Resolution of the Live Stock Division of the National Food Administration of Montana, urging the use of the Missoula County buffalo pasture for grazing, and also the use, under certain restrictions, of national parks for the same purpose; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Resolutions adopted by 62 churches, organizations, and mass meetings in the first congressional district of Oregon, favoring war prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Westerly (R. I.) Central Labor Union, protesting against Borland eight-hour amendment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of Electrical Workers' Union of Minneapolis, stating that the Twin City street car situation is becoming alarming, and urges immediate action by Congress and the Federal Government, and further states that labor will do its utmost to avoid trouble at this time, further asking a square deal for labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of organized labor of Minneapolis, urging immediate action by the Federal Government in their behalf in connection with the street car controversy and the recent failure of the Federal mediation board to settle that controversy, further stating that at a mass meeting in Minneapolis and St. Paul March 20 the sympathetic strike was up for general discussion, further stating that the Teamsters' Joint Council, George Guider, president, joins in the petition; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill 10910, for the relief of Thomas A. Jenkins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Memorial of the Presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church, Whittier, Cal., in favor of prohibition of intoxicating liquors during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition from Rev. George C. Poole and sundry other citizens of Millport, N. Y., urging the immediate enactment by Congress of a war-prohibition measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SWITZER: Petition of the D. Zenner Co. and 30 others for extension of time for payment of excess-profits taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of the Little Kanawha and Ohio Valley Medical Society, the Tyler County Medical Society, and the Ritchie County Medical Society, all of West Virginia, fixing the grades of the commissioned officers of the Medical Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, March 22, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the truth that Thou hast revealed unto men is the pledge of Thy favor, and in itself is the covenant that Thou dost make with those who are willing to follow the truth. As we seek to apply the great principles that Thou hast made known unto men to our civil government we pray Thy direction and Thy guidance and blessing, not only here in this place where we shape the policy of the Nation, but we pray Thee to bless those who represent us on the battle field, that they may be protected by Thy kind providence, that they may be inspired by the loftiest and highest ideals of Christian citizenship, that they may be preserved from danger, and that they may be given the supreme privilege of winning a great victory for humanity and freedom and truth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.